is in a position to do so definitely this afternoon, will give assurance that the Senate will have sessions on Wednesday and Thursday nights.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to restate the announcement made at noon today, that there definitely will be a session of the Senate Wednesday night, and that Senators should hold themselves in readiness for a session Thursday night, because if the pending bill is not terminated by that time I at least will ask the Senate to remain in session that night. I should like to see a final determination on the question of a night session on Thursday left to the majority leader, but I have talked with the Senator from Maine, and I am quite satisfied that if the consideration of the bill shall not be concluded in the Thursday afternoon session, we will be called upon to have a session Thursday night, and Senators should make their arrangements accordingly, and be ready to attend a session that night if necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I intend to vote against the pending bill, but I wish to say that if—as I fear it will—it should get us into war, atomic war, one of these days, my services will be available wherever I am, if I do not happen to be a Member of the Senate. Wherever I am, my services will be at the disposal of my country. I have three sons, one 11 years old, one 5 years old, and one 9 months old. They will be ready to fight some of these days. I will curse the day they have to, but I will send them if their country needs them. There will be no doubt of the unanimity of our country after the policy is adopted, but I am opposed to the policy, and I am going to vote against the bill.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the Senate tomorrow, Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence from the Senate from this afternoon until Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection. leave is granted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence until Friday or Saturday of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 16, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 15 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George R. Merrell, of Missouri, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, to be the representative of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina, to be the alternate representative of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve to be a second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the date stated:

Richard J. Sullivan, from the 16th day of November 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 15 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

James M. Alsup to be a collector of internal revenue for the district of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be a medical director

Carl E. Rice

To be a temporary senior dental surgeon

Norman F. Gerrie

To be a temporary senior surgeon

John B. Alsever

To be a temporary senior nurse officer

Minnie E. Pohe

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be a senior sanitary engineer (lieutenant colonel), effective date of oath of office

Leonard H. Male

To be a senior scientist (lieutenant colonel), effective date of oath of office

Justin M. Andrews

To be scientists (major), effective date of oath of office

Sidney H. Newman
Samuel W. Simmons

To be surgeons (major), effective date of oath of office

Alexander A. Doerner
Russell E. Teague
Abraham Wikler

To be a dental surgeon (major), effective date of oath of office

Norman F. Gerrie

To be a nurse officer (major), effective date of oath of office

Hazel A. Shortal

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be a brigadier general

Marshall Sylvester Carter

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate April 15 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

POSTMASTERS

Miss Ellowene Zinke to be postmaster at Hamlin in the State of Iowa.

John R. Johnson to be postmaster at Fairview in the State of Montana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Eternal Spirit, Thou hast laid the foundations of heaven and reared their walls in power and glory. Forever shall our praise ascend and forever let the tides of blessing come down. O Thou who art the inspiration of all that is good and the glory of all that is beautiful, send forth Thy light, reminding us of our place and our calling. Do Thou open the windows of our minds that we may receive the spirit and the love of truth, thus turning hesitation into fortitude. Undergird and uphold our firm belief in the ultimate triumph of the good, for nothing else in equal measure has ever taught us so much how to live. In every situation, inspire us to think truly, to speak and live truly; then shall our daily lives be open books of great and noble creeds. In the holy name of Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 14, 1947:

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports.

On April 15, 1947:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period; and

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a

speech I made last evening before the Ohio Society of New York City, in which I discussed the challenge that the spread of communism presents to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate on the bill H. R. 3020.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

[Mr. TWYMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 181 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of House Report No. 245, current session, submitted to accompany the bill (H. R. 3020) relating to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, of which 3,000 copies shall be for the House document room and 2,000 for the use of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a short editorial from a New Jersey newspaper and in the other to include a resolution passed by the New Jersey State Legislature.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an essay written by Roger Brucker, winner of the American Legion contest.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], that the committee may be permitted to sit during general debate on the pending measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Henry Wallace is out sowing the seeds of hate in the world, I believe he should be recalled and made to account for his actions. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other to include a radio address made by him last Thursday in Boston over radio station WMEX.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorial comments.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution passed by the State of South Carolina requesting the National Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal-leave pay heretofore issued in nontransferable bonds.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a review on the disposition of OPA cases, the general sanction policies, and various exceptions granted.

Mr. ALMOND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an Army Day address made by him.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorial material.

THE GRECO-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I was talking to a man who has had considerable experience in refrigeration and heating engineering. He told me he has been talking to men in the steel industry, and they were very much concerned about the President's program for Turkey, Greece, and other countries, because they said that what those countries needed most are railroad rails, engines, cars, and other things manufactured from steel. They were afraid if the program were carried out the steel industry would be back in the same condition it was during the war, with limited allocations to the industries in this country; that is, the railroads, the automobile industry, the refrigeration industry, and the like, so that we would have shortages and perhaps another OPA or something like it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS] has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from the hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities; and also an article from the April issue of Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, before we go to war with anyone it might be well to set our own house in order. Today and tomorrow there will be general debate on the labor bill. If there is anyone in this House who has any doubt as to the need for legislation, freeing American businessmen and American workers, including union men, from dictators and racketeers, it is suggested that you read not only the Labor Committee's report and as much of the hearings as you can, but that you go over in the northwest

corner of this room and get a copy of the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which has been investigating racketeering. If a reading of the report does not satisfy you, then read the record of the hearings and you will get the story. If you will do that you will have no doubt about the absolute necessity for labor legislation now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Rev. Geoffrey C. Stone.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein the text of the recent address by President Truman relating to our beloved leader and late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 178 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, this is a subject of such importance that I believe we should have a quorum present. I therefore make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Battle	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Poulson
Bender	Hart	Rains
Bennett, Mich.	Havenner	Rayburn
Bland	Hull	Rayfiel
Boykin	Jennings	Sanborn
Brophy	Johnson, Tex.	Sasscer
Buckley	Jones, N. C.	Scoblick
Byrne, N. Y.	Judd	Scott, Hardie
Clark	Kefauver	Short
Clippinger	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Colmer	Keogh	Smith, Maine
Combs	Knutson	Smith, Va.
Cooley	Lynch	Stanley
Coudert	McGarvey	Stockman
Cravens	McMahon	Talle
Crawford	Mansfield, Tex.	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Meade, Md.	Tollefson
Domengeaux	Merrow	Vail
Fallon	Mitchell	Vorys
Fuller	Morrison	West
Gallagher	Norrell	Wood
Gerlach	Norton	Woodruff
Gifford	Patman	Worley
Goodwin	Poage	
Grant, Ala.		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 357 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks in the Committee of the Whole a statement by the American Federation of Labor with reference to the bill H. R. 3020.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech by Mr. Adolph Berle on displaced persons.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

I also yield myself such of my 30 minutes as I may require.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the immediate consideration of H. R. 3020, a bill to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

This, undoubtedly, is one of the most far-reaching and one of the most important bills that any Member of this Congress will be asked to vote on. The bill was written as a bill of rights for the laboring man; to protect him from exploitation by employers and from encroachments on his individual rights by radical labor union leaders. Realizing that conclusions reached after fair and open discussion will produce a superior bill, the Committee on Rules has provided 6 hours of general debate on H. R. 3020. In these 6 hours, the general provisions of this bill can be explained adequately and debated extensively. Each Member of the House will have an opportunity to offer amendments to the bill; and each will be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes on each amendment offered. This rule is the most liberal that can be granted; and it needs no defense. Points of order have not been waived; amendments are in order; and one motion to recommit the bill has been provided. I do not see how any minority Member of the House—even the most adamant—can raise any objection to this rule; nor can minority Members say that they have not been given fair treatment or ample opportunity for presentation of their views on this bill.

I would like to point out that this bill redeems the third major pledge which the Republican Party made to the Nation last November. We promised, first, to reduce governmental spending. The Republicans in the House redeemed this promise when they passed House Concurrent Resolution 20, which cut the administration's budget estimate by $6,000,000,000. We also promised to relieve the taxpayers of some of the heavy burden they have borne for a number of years. The Republicans in the House made good on this promise when they passed H. R. 1, the bill reducing individual income taxes. We also promised that we would write a law establishing a fair and equitable relationship between management and labor. H. R. 3020 redeems that promise.

Since the Republican Party assumed control last January, the left-wing propagandists have resorted to sniping tactics in an effort to belittle Congress. They paint lurid pictures of confusion and intra-party strife which, they claim, stymie all important legislation. In the next breath these propagandists charge that a few powerful men dominate the Republican Congress, and that these few steamroller bills through the House and the Senate. From these conflicting statements coming from the administration's propaganda machine in the Government departments and from other sources close to the Democratic National Committee, it would appear that it is the propagandists who are confused. Between now and the next national election you can look for an endless succession of inspired pronouncements from the White House designed to make the Republican effort seem small and trivial.

During the national election of 1932, the Democrats made a number of prom-

ises to the voters, and on the basis of these promises they assumed control of the Federal Government. I would like to read for you the first two paragraphs of the 1932 platform of the Democratic Party. These are the exact words:

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe. We hereby declare this to be the platform of the Democratic Party:

The Democratic Party solemnly promises by appropriate action to put into effect the principles, policies, and reforms herein advocated, and to eradicate the policies, methods, and practices herein condemned. We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditure by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.

That is what the Democrats promised when they assumed control of the Government in 1933. Now let us see how they kept those promises. First, they promised an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures. At the time the Democrats made this promise, the annual cost of the Federal Government was $3,363,000,000. In the first full fiscal year under the Democratic administration, Federal expenditures nearly doubled, and appropriations increased steadily in each succeeding year. In the fiscal year 1934, for example, Federal expenditures amounted to more than $6,000,000,000; in 1935, seven billions; in 1936 the New Dealers spent more than $8,500,000,000. Well, that takes care of the first campaign promise of the Democrats.

In a solemn covenant with the people the New Deal promised to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government. To redeem this promise, the Democrats increased the cost of government by more than 250 percent in the first 4 years of their administration. As for abolishing useless commissions and offices, and consolidating departments and bureaus—which the Democrats also promised—I would merely like to point out that the number of Federal agencies doubled under the New Deal.

I do not know where all of this propaganda is coming from, charging that the Republican Congress is doing nothing—but I think that the 45,000 propagandists on the Federal pay roll have a great deal to do with it. Through all of the devious devices at its disposal, the administration is trying to make the efforts of this Congress seem trivial. Almost every report or press release issued by a Government department "snipes" directly or indirectly at this Congress. The administration has utilized every possible method to obstruct the Republican Congress in carrying out its promises to our citizens. Pressure groups from Federal bureaus have converged on Congress to prevent reductions in appropriations; the entire administration has united to prevent a reduction in Government personnel; the New Deal obstructionists in Congress have opposed every measure, but despite all of these obstacles the Republican Congress has redeemed the promises made last November.

Now, let us look at the work record of this Republican Congress, which the left-wing propagandists charge "has done nothing." As of April 1, 3,265 measures had been introduced 16 bills had been enacted into law; 99 House bills had been reported from committees, and 59 of these had been passed; but, most important, we Republicans in the House have done our level best to fulfill the promises we made to the people of the United States.

This bill does not seek to curb any of the legitimate rights or privileges of labor or labor unions. Its sole purpose is to eliminate the injustices arising out of conflicting provisions in the two basic Federal statutes regulating labor relations, the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It is not my intention to attempt to fix responsibility for the present hodgepodge laws defining labor's rights and management's responsibility, but to point out why we have not a basic, unified statute insuring industrial peace.

Neither Congress nor the Executive has the power to regulate labor relations. Such power is not specifically granted by our Constitution, and therefore it remains within the jurisdiction of the individual States. Consequently, in order to regulate labor relations, Congress has used its powers to regulate interstate commerce, and its powers to define and control the jurisdiction of the courts. The Wagner Act and the Railway Labor Act, for example, are both based on the authority of Congress to regulate interstate commerce; and the Norris-LaGuardia Act is the result of the power of Congress to define the jurisdiction and procedure of the courts. As a result of this limitation on the powers of Congress, and the necessity of using other powers that have been specifically delegated by the Constitution, national labor policy has been expressed indirectly and in a somewhat fragmentary manner.

These unrelated laws, enacted at different times, and to attain various objectives, have always been shaped by what appears to be the most needed reforms of the moment, and they are seldom suitable to accomplish long-range objectives. Such laws must be revised from time to time to meet the needs of changed conditions, and to solve contemporary labor problems. When the Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed in 1932, followed by the Wagner Act in 1935, labor was the underdog, and such legislation was needed to equalize labor's bargaining position. Until then, management was able to control the conditions of labor, and these laws were drawn entirely for labor's benefit. Neither law put any restrictions whatsoever on labor unions. Under the interpretation of these acts, unions can do no wrong. But public opinion at the time favored these laws to counterbalance the tremendous advantage of management over labor. Had Congress the power to regulate labor relations, per se, a bill that was just to both management and labor might have been passed instead of the fragmentary acts of 1932 and 1935, and such a law might still have stood—and continue to stand—as a guide to the fair settlement of labor disputes. But as Congress can attack the problem only in an indirect manner, we can settle only the pressing problems of the moment.

In justice to ourselves, to the national economy, and to the public welfare, and in the interest of both labor and management, Congress must work out a national labor policy providing justice to all. Because of the constitutional limitations on our power in this respect, such a policy can only result from careful experimentation. Congress can only throw its weight on the side of labor or on the side of management, as inequalities on either side of the industrial scale manifest themselves. In this way we can strive for eventual balance.

Inconsistencies in the provisions and interpretations of our present laws sometimes cause gross injustice to innocent persons, and some labor disputes simply cannot be settled at all under present laws. It probably seems inconceivable to most of you that any situation could arise to which there is no solution, but it is possible, and I will give you a specific example to prove it.

Let us take a manufacturing enterprise employing, say, a thousand people. We will suppose that 900 of these employees are members of the CIO and that 100 of them are members of the A. F. of L. Because the plant is predominantly CIO, the National Labor Relations Board would certify the CIO as bargaining agent for all employees. Under the Wagner Act, as interpreted, the employer cannot bargain with anyone but the certified bargaining representative. But suppose the 100 A. F. of L. members should insist that the employer make a separate contract with them. The employer cannot accede to their wishes, as this would be a violation of the Wagner Act. So the members of the A. F. of L. go on strike and put a picket line around the plant. All union members will honor the picket line. Not even the 900 employees who are members of the CIO will cross the picket line to go to work—even though the employer has a contract with them, and even though the strike is the result of the employer's desire to abide by the contract. The employer is now faced with this situation. He cannot manufacture anything; he cannot close his plant, because this would be a lock-out, which is forbidden by the Wagner Act; he cannot bargain with the striking union, as this would be unlawful under the Wagner Act; and he cannot get an injunction to stop the strike, because injunctions are forbidden by the Norris-LaGuardia Act. So you can see there is just no answer to this man's problem.

I am certain that those who drafted our present labor laws never envisioned a situation such as I have just cited, or they would have made provision for it. But the inequalities and injustices that

have made themselves apparent cannot be completely ignored. Adjustment must be made in the basic laws. If these adjustments do not completely solve all the problems that come within their purview, then the laws must be adjusted again and again, until they become the standard of justice that laws should be.

In drafting laws, we sometimes make the mistake of thinking that fair-minded men will use them in good faith to resolve their differences with justice to both sides. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. Unscrupulous men on both sides of the dispute will disregard the intent of Congress and seek to enforce their will through the technicalities of the law. As this is the case, Congress must define and spell out the details of such laws so that they cannot be misunderstood or misinterpreted. But Congress must never assume that all unscrupulous men are on one side or the other of any disagreement. Unfortunately, that is the assumption of the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act. But we—here, now—do not want to make the same error. We do not want to penalize labor for any gains they made under existing laws. It should be our goal to keep all of the good provisions of existing law which benefit labor and labor unions, and at the same time to provide methods and procedures for resolving disputes which cannot be resolved under present law. This is the kind of a law fair-minded union leaders want, that management wants, and that the public wants—and this is the kind of labor law Congress should give them.

THIS RULE MAKES IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF THE MOST VICIOUS, RESTRICTIVE, AND DESTRUCTIVE ANTILABOR BILL EVER BROUGHT BEFORE TH HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, yes, this rule is open; but under the bill the rights of labor are closed.

Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that regardless of what I may say or advise, you are fully set to pass the most vicious, restrictive, and destructive antilabor bill every brought before this House, and to adopt this rule which will make its consideration in order.

Consequently, I shall not use my full time, and request that I be reminded when I have consumed 15 minutes. I also ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain editorials and articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

"I FEAR THE GREEKS WHEN THEY BEAR GIFTS"

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago someone circulated a mimeographed sheet which purports to set forth the 18 points of this so-called "bill of rights" for labor. I do not know whether this circular was prepared by some member of the committee or by the Association of Manufacturers; but I am inevitably reminded of Virgil's admonition, "I fear the Greeks even when they bear gifts." Certainly, the "gifts" of this bill to labor should be feared.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has stated to you that this bill was brought in after due and careful consideration and in accordance with promises made to the American people before the last election. I concede that you made enough promises; but were they all made to the American people? You promised many things to the American people which you have not fulfilled. You promised that if the Price Control Act were repealed American housewives—for restaurants, clubs, and hotels seemed to have no scarcity of meat—would be able to buy all the meat they wanted at reasonable cost, and that the black market in commodities would be wiped out. Well, price control was ended; the packers called off their strike against the public; and cattle, hogs, and sheep did begin a wild stampede to market; but at what prices. You wiped out the black market by making black-market prices legal.

BUSINESS NEVER FREER THAN DURING LAST 14 YEARS

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] asserted that this bill will free American businessmen from what he called labor racketeers.

Mr. Speaker, business has never been freer than during the past 14 years of Democratic administration.

Business has been freed of bankruptcy; of ruthless competition from monopolies; of the vicious cycles of boom and bust which we fear are now returning to us; of exorbitant interest charges and collusive securities rigging. Business has never been so free to accumulate huge surpluses, and to make high profits, with a virtually guaranteed mass market.

LABOR NOT THE RACKETEER

Yes, Mr. Speaker; I will admit there has been some racketeering, but not by organized labor. Look at the wartime profits rolled up by respectable and powerful business firms; look at the concessions lobbied through Congress in the way of tax forgiveness, rebates, carry-back credits, repeal of excess-profits excises, and most recently generous reductions in tax rates.

I concede that during the war there were some restrictions on business and industry. There were controls on what could be made and how it could be sold. Would you have had it otherwise? Are profits more important than the safety of our beloved country? God alone knows how this Nation would have fared had those controls been removed in the first year after the war. We can get some hint by seeing how commodity prices have shot up 70 percent since last June and how business profits have climbed up and up and up, until the staid, respectable, and reliable City Bank of New York can report in its monthly letter that the average profits of 237 concerns were, in 1946, 36 percent above the profits of 1945 after all taxes were paid.

Where have working people increased their take-home pay 36 percent in only 12 months?

SOME INDUSTRIES ALMOST DOUBLED NET

You need only to read the daily newspapers, or the publications of big financial reporting houses, or the business magazines, or official and impartial Government reports to learn how corporate earnings have climbed up and up and up, as rapidly and as high as prices of the things we have to buy to eat, while wages and salaries have stood still, or even slipped back.

I present here a brief table, abstracted from published reports, showing how the net profits, after taxes, depreciation, interest, and reserves, have almost doubled in nine selected industrial groups. While I have selected deliberately some of those with highest return, I have not by any means exhausted the list of increases in net earnings exceeding 50 percent over 1945, and have not touched those which increased from 10 to 50 percent.

Net income of leading corporations for the years 1945 and 1946

Industrial groups	Net income after taxes		Percent of increase
	1945	1946	
Furniture and wood products	$6,316,000	$11,915,000	88.6
Household equipment	16,927,000	32,618,000	92.7
Printing and publishing	17,647,000	31,478,000	80.2
Paint and varnish	20,675,000	36,682,000	77.4
Office equipment	31,052,000	58,173,000	76.0
Dairy products	38,989,000	65,454,000	67.9

A. T. & T. RESERVES EQUAL THIRD OF PLANT VALUE

I know that before this debate is over we shall hear much of the only important strike now in progress—that of the National Federation of Telephone Workers, an unaffiliated national union—against the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and many of its operating subsidiaries.

That is the only strike there is to talk about of any size.

We have read the company side of the disputes in expensive paid advertisements, which doubtless will be deducted from taxable income.

Who has heard the side of the workers—for the most part girls and women trying to maintain their families single-handed, or to help share the burden of existence in a struggle for existence where the dollar has lost over half its buying power in 12 months?

Here are a few facts: Year after year, through depression and through boom, A. T. & T. has paid 9 percent dividends; yet the United States Government can sell its bonds at 2½ percent without difficulty. A. T. & T. has cash reserves for depreciation of $2,200,000,000—$2,200,000,000—which amounts to exactly one-third of its physical plant value of $6,600,000,000.

Despite this obvious prosperity, the average weekly income for all Bell System employees, which includes many high-salaried experts, is less than the national average for all manufacturing, and the average weekly wage of the women operators is $13 less than the average of all industry.

PAY CHECKS THIRD BELOW AVERAGE

The average pay check for the "hello girls" in January of this year, as shown by official figures, was $33 a week—considerably under the minimum income required to maintain a family of three at minimum comfort.

The average pay check for all telephone employees was $43.19 a week.

At the same time, the national average for all manufacturing was $46.94; the average in the bankrupt Western Union Telegraph Co. was $46.83; the average in the light-and-power industry was $54; and in the rubber-goods industry, which is perhaps the closest to the telephone industry in its proportion of low-paid woman operators and highly paid technicians, the average weekly pay was $54.26.

Western Electric, a 99-percent-owned subsidiary with a monopolistic control of manufacturing and supplying the Bell System, has the astounding depreciation reserve of $121,000,000—over 60 percent of the invested plant value of $194,000,000.

While underpaid telephone operators walk the streets in picket lines, a Bell System subsidiary out in Cincinnati, practically a family affair of a Republican leader, is cutting a juicy stock melon dripping with a virtual 100-percent profit—but limited to one share of new stock for each six outstanding shares held. That keeps the profit out of the hands of employee owners. This particular company, Cincinnati & Suburban, has not one dollar of bonded indebtedness.

I hear no censure of the Bell Telephone System, no threats, no denunciations.

LABOR DOES NOT LIKE STRIKES

We have heard much in this House in recent years about strikes, as if workers were horses and mules with no right of protest save to die.

Labor does not like strikes. They bankrupt the unions, bankrupt the workers. They fall with devastating burden on the women and children—on the families. But it is the duty of a man to earn a living for his family. When he cannot maintain his family in decent American style, and when he has exhausted every resource of negotiation with an employer with millions to his pennies, the strike is his weapon of last resort. Violence is unfortunate; I deplore it; but it is inevitable when he sees strikebreakers going in to his job. The Bible tells us, "The laborer is worthy of his hire." When a man works all day and cannot pay rent, buy food and clothes, and protect his children, and the company he works for makes high profits, he has only the right to abstain from work to gain that hire of which he is worthy.

He must organize to make his protest effective.

And make no mistake about this: Labor organizations have helped business, have stabilized working conditions, reduced turn-over, increased production, reduced expenses, and created better workmen.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] stated that the New Deal promised to reduce expenditures as far back as 1932. The gentleman in the well of the House now addressing us was here in 1932. I ask him, what did it cost to feed the 14,000,000 idle people that the Republicans left us with in 1933?

Mr. SABATH. I did not wish to go into that matter, but to the query of the gentleman I will say that by 1932, when the Democrats were swept into power by a people outraged by such perverted ignoring of the national problems as is represented by this bill, we had more nearly 18,000,000 than 14,000,000 people unemployed, farmers without markets, food spoiling for lack of buyers, milk strikes everywhere, foreclosures, empty office buildings, closed factories, vacant dwellings, and a national income which had shrunk to about one-fifth of that which we anticipate in 1947. The crash began, it is true, in 1929; but it came because we had been living for 10 years in a fool's paradise of unreality. The Republicans believed then, as now, that all we had to do to maintain prosperity was to keep labor in its place and business free of all control and responsibility except that of making profits and then more profits, amassing property, creating the tools of production without any concept of their responsibilities to society or their country.

That bubble burst.

Then the Democrats under President Roosevelt had to rebuild the economy.

The people had to be fed, clothed, housed, returned to useful work. Banks, railroads, insurance companies, factories, merchants, farmers, processors had to be bailed out of the Republican quagmire of irresponsibility, corruption, and extravagant wastage of our natural resources.

That all took money, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] suggests.

No one—not even the Republican Party whips—can deny that under Roosevelt the Democrats brought about present-day conditions; that without any loss of liberty, without any loss of political freedom or economic freedom—nay, Mr. Speaker, with positive gains of freedom, of equality, of justice, of a more abundant life—we have reached the highest employment, the highest national income, the highest national production, in all history. The only flaw is that under a Republican assault on the administration program controls were removed too soon, and prices and wages are completely out of balance.

I do not believe that anything this Republican majority can do will spoil that prosperity in the next 16 months; but I do not believe that the way to remedy the disparity between prices and incomes is to prohibit workers from making effective demands. The way to guard against subversion is by making our democracy work; and we help make it work by making workers as secure and as prosperous as the employers are.

NAME CALLING WILL NOT HIDE VICIOUSNESS OF BILL

My colleague has repeatedly coupled "left wing" and "New Deal" in his speech in the effort to smear all progressives who have the best interests of labor, agriculture, free and honest business, and of the American people at heart.

This is an old and time-worn trick. It may work for a while, but no amount of name calling can hide the vicious nature of this bill, which has one purpose only—to destroy the rights of organized labor, and with it the rights of all labor.

Nor is there anything new in this technique.

AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT 150 YEARS OLD

The American labor movement is just 150 years old.

The first labor union came into being not long after the adoption of the Constitution; and the Federal Society of Journeymen Cordwainers won their first strike.

Big business—small by our modern-day standards but respectable enough in the bustling days of the new Republic—immediately sought means to break the unions. They found it when they found a court which did not raise an eyebrow over the association of the manufacturers, but indicted the unionists for criminal conspiracy, found them guilty, and fined them; and then the strikers were blacklisted.

After years of struggle criminal conspiracy charges were outlawed; but ingenious industrialists found many another trick to keep labor from organizing, or, if they did dare to organize, to jail them, fine them, blacklist them, or even have them beaten up, shot, evicted.

STRUGGLE FOR UNIONIZATION CONTINUES

Notwithstanding threats, abuse, misrepresentation, fear, privation, law by injunction, even sudden death, the struggle for unionization continued. Panics and depressions destroyed unions when guns and blackjacks could not. Introduction of pitifully underpaid and overworked child and female labor threw back union organization many years.

Liberal leaders, both from the ranks of labor and from among the intellectuals and the politicians, were discredited and driven from their own communities and from public life for no other reason than that they earnestly sought to bring living wages and decent living conditions to their fellow workers. Your party, Mr. Speaker, has led in that kind of reprisal for many years.

KNIGHTS OF LABOR EMERGE FROM STRUGGLE

Even when local unions were formed, or national craft organizations brought into being, industrialists managed to keep them divided so that there could be no national solidarity among labor organizations, although Nation-wide federations were proposed often enough.

Finally, in 1869, the Noble Order of the Knights of Labor was organized by Uriah S. Stephens, and became Nation-wide in scope and influence. Under the leadership of Terence V. Powderly, the Knights of Labor was a power which profoundly influenced the politics and the economics of the Nation from 1879 to 1893. Although originally a secret order, the Knights of Labor at its height comprised 702,000 members and was organized along lines comparable to contemporary industrial unions—the horizontal pattern of unionization, although craft unions were included among its constituents, just as the CIO today includes some crafts among its member unions.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR FORMED

However, the power of the crafts in the Knights of Labor became ascendant over the broader concepts held by Powderly, and out of the conflict of aims and directions the American Federation of Labor emerged with a new direction for organized workers.

By 1893 the Knights of Labor had virtually departed from the scene, and the alliance between farm, labor, and some white-collar groups held together by Powderly's dream of a full life fell apart.

Led by the sagacious Samuel Gompers, the American Federation of Labor became a sound and solid national organization in the vertical pattern of craft unionization, modeled closely on the British Trades-Union Congress. The AFL was actually organized in 1886, after 5 years of preparatory work, and rose rapidly to power and influence and solidity.

PROGRESS SLOW AND PAINFUL

The road to progress has been slow and painful.

I myself, in the span of my own lifetime, can remember when all unionists were reviled as anarchists and Socialists, or both, just as now it is in style to call every unionist, every progressive, every liberal, a Communist or fellow traveler.

Nevertheless, progress has been real.

Many present-day institutions which even Republicans accept as a fundamental part of the American scene are the product—and in many instances the recent product—of labor organizations' activities. To name only a few: Free public education, universal manhood suffrage, the homestead laws, the 8-hour day, the income tax, workmen's compensation, safety installations on railroads, industrial safety appliances, social security, postal savings, and many other noble concepts which we now take as a matter of course originated with discussions in labor organizations.

With these reforms labor won real and solid benefits of its own. From the days of Woodrow Wilson on, progress has been rapid. The Norris-LaGuardia Act outlawing labor injunctions, the statutory guaranty of the right to organize and bargain collectively, retirement systems, wage-and-hour laws, the right to picket, the right of laboring men and their families to be secure in their own homes against assault and violence, have followed and accompanied social benefits.

THIS BILL WOULD SUCK OUT THE SUBSTANCE OF RIGHTS

This bill, Mr. Speaker, would suck out the substance of those hard-won rights, and leave but the bare bones, stripped of their meat and sinew.

This bill is hypocritical in the extreme.

If you were honest, you would gather together in this omnibus bill all the other rights and benefits for which good American blood has been shed—for which good American bodies have suffered jail and beatings and death—and strip away free schools, the vote, the 8-hour day, the 10-hour day, too, for that matter, the Railroad Retirement Act, the Wages and Hours Act—for what was left after the Gwynne bill went through.

You would say, frankly and openly, that you wanted to turn the clock back 150 years.

You have taken an almost equally brutal course with this bill, which would leave the unions as not much more than social clubs where the workers could gather and curse the bosses and their representatives. You have talked about communism and the left wing—this is the way to breed subversion.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS HELP ALL LABOR

Members of unions do not enjoy alone the benefits of labor organization. Not only the 18,000,000 workers joined together in the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Railway Brotherhoods, and many independent and unaffiliated unions, but all the 58,000,000 American workers share in the progress brought about by organized labor.

Many of you remember the bloody struggle to bring about, first the 10-hour day, then the 8-hour day. You remember the bitter fights against safety appliances in railroads—and every big businessman riding in a pullman car can thank organized labor for making that ride safe and comfortable—and against prohibiting sweatshop slavery for children and women. Millions who have never paid a dime to a union share in the benefits brought about by labor organization.

Is that the reason you wish to destroy the unions?

LEAVE WELL ENOUGH ALONE

If you gentlemen were fair, if you were not drunk with brief power, you would leave well enough alone.

If you will not examine the misdeeds of business, at least you would not wreak your vengeance on the American workers.

Today we have not less than 58,000,000 people at work—perhaps as many as 59,000,000. That is the greatest number of employed workers in peacetime in all history. With only minor exceptions, we have industrial peace throughout the Nation. Labor and management are learning to work out their own problems over the conference table, guided and advised by the Federal Conciliation Service.

Yet, like the Whigs and Federalists of 150 years ago, you would strip labor of all organizational rights, while ignoring the collusive organizations of industry and business, many times bearing such deceptive names as institutes and bureaus and other innocent-sounding titles behind which industries are organized far more authoritatively than any union can ever organize. These industrial organizations, however they are styled—whether institutes, trade associations, bureaus, chambers, committees, or what have you—are effective and tightly controlled. They know what they want and they go after it. Not their conscience, or the public interest, but what they can get away with, is the limit of their actions. They do not hesitate to spread poisoned propaganda to the public in the effort to justify their refusal to grant a decent living wage and security to their employees. Why do you propose no restrictions on them?

INSUFFICIENT TIME TO STUDY BILL

Even if I had my full youthful health and vigor, I could not come before you today, Mr. Speaker, claiming to have studied all the vicious implications of this bill.

I could obtain a copy of the bill, with its 66 pages, and of the report, containing 116 pages, only yesterday morning. I do not believe the printed hearings are even now available. Yet had I read all of yesterday, and last night, and this morning, foregoing all other duties, I could not have claimed to have read and studied them sufficiently to know all the hidden meanings and injustices contained in this infamous measure. Its backers must have spent years preparing it secretly and minutely to strip organized labor of all meaning.

I shall not attempt any detailed discussion of the bill, for those who follow me in general debate, and particularly those six who signed the minority report, will do that expertly.

And when all the facts are in, and the full meaning of this omnibus antilabor bill is made clear, I am confident that the American people, to whom fair play and equal justice is the essence of the democratic way of life, will be shocked and dismayed, and will repudiate the bill and all its supporters.

STORM OF DISAPPROVAL ALREADY GATHERING

That storm of disapproval already is gathering. At this point I am inserting in my remarks an editorial entitled "Monkey Wrench and Banana Oil" from an independent Chicago newspaper with more than a half-million circulation, the Chicago Times—a newspaper with a reputation for letting the chips hit anybody in range—which compares the tactics of the Republican Party on this omnibus bill with the disruption tactics of the Communist Party:

MONKEY WRENCH AND BANANA OIL

When the Republicans were campaigning for votes last fall, they told one and all that they were the sole possessors of a magic oil which would make the Nation's industrial machine run smoothly. It is beginning to look now as though the lubrication they had in mind was banana oil.

Instead of passing legislation which will take the squeaks and slow-downs out of our industrial machinery, the Republican bosses are all set to toss a monkey wrench in the works and jam it up, but good.

The monkey wrench is labeled "Politics."

The Republican leadership plans to shove through Congress a drastic labor bill. This bill will include moderate legislation that President Truman has asked for. It also will include out-and-out antiunion legislation that is supported only by the far right and is opposed by sincere, serious experts on labor problems.

The Republican leadership cannot honestly expect President Truman to approve the "all-or-nothing" measure. The GOP leadership cannot expect to be able to pass the measure over his veto. That's part of the diabolical, political plan.

The Republicans would say if labor conditions went from bad to worse: 'We tried to pass a labor bill, but the President vetoed it. So now we have industrial chaos."

If the Republicans were sincerely trying to improve industrial conditions, they would pass a series of labor bills, each of which would be designed to correct defects in our present system. If the President should veto one or more, those that he approved at least would remain to serve their purpose. Mr. Truman, for example, would approve a bill forbidding jurisdictional strikes. But he could not be expected to go along with the right-wing measure to abolish the National Labor Relations Board.

On Washington correspondent explains the Republican position this way: "The Republican leaders decided to risk their entire labor policy in one omnibus bill."

That's misleading. The GOP risks nothing. In fact, the omnibus bill doesn't represent any one policy—it represents a mad jumble of every labor panacea proposed.

The real risk in the course the GOP leadership is pursuing is to the Nation's own welfare. The all-or-nothing policy is out of harmony with the American spirit of fair compromise. It threatens to sabatoge industrial peace in the hope of making President Truman look bad in the upcoming Presidential election year. The GOP would then say: "Only a Republican President can bring labor peace."

Last fall they said: "Only a Republican Congress can legislate intelligently on the labor front."

If Republican leaders continue on the course, which alarms many veteran reporters of events in Washington, they will be no better morally than the Communists whose strategy also calls for industrial chaos in order to bring about political revolution.

DR. NOURSE WARNS OF FUTURE DANGER

And here, Mr. Speaker, is part of an article which reports on the statements attributed to Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, chairman of the Economic Counsel, the body which we charged with the task of studying and reporting on economic conditions, and of recommending appropriate actions when we passed the full-employment bill at the recent Cabinet meeting. Bear in mind that Dr. Nourse is no radical, no demagog, no alarmist. His appointment brought universal approbation.

DR. NOURSE'S WARNING

1. Prices have increased about 70 percent on all commodities since last July 1. Foodstuffs have gone up about 80 percent, raw materials about 55 percent on an average.

2. In some fields, wholesalers and retailers are pricing themselves out of the market. The demand for certain goods—clothing, women's apparel, and shoes—has dropped to the danger point. Even in lines recently scarce, such as radios, refrigerators, and higher-priced automobiles, Nourse reported, demand is going way down.

3. While prices have increased, consumers' wages have dropped. This disturbed Nourse greatly. Secretary of the Interior Krug and Secretary of Commerce Harriman backed him up regarding this.

The figures used by Nourse for his conclusions show that wages dropped about $5,500,000,000 between the first quarter of 1945 and the last quarter of 1946.

However, while wages dropped in 1945, profits soared. During 1945 net corporate profits were $9,000,000,000. In 1946, with wages dropping, profits climbed to $12,000,000,000. However, that was only part of the story. During the last quarter of 1946 profits were mounting at the rate of $14,900,000,000 for the year, and during the first quarter of this year they increased at an even higher rate.

During this same period wages were tumbling from a 1945 high of $111,000,000,000 to $106,000,000,000 in 1946—and still going down in 1947. That was why Mr. Truman made his statement the day after the Cabinet meeting that if prices don't come down, wages must go up.

ARE WE "STUMBLING TO DISASTER?"

I insert also an editorial from the Progressive entitled "Stumbling to Disaster." This newspaper is owned and published by a Republican. I hope that all Republicans will take special note of the editorial. Let me say in introducing it that, even though it comes from the most recent issue, some of the figures on price increases already are obsolete. Both corporation profits and consumer prices are far higher than those used in this editorial.

STUMBLING TO DISASTER

Strikes and threats of strikes dominated so much of the front-page news during the past week that there was little or no room for basic, official facts piling up about the causes of renewed labor restiveness.

The facts are simply told and easily digested:

Fact No. 1: Corporation profits have soared 34 percent in a single year and are now at the highest peak in the war or peacetime history of the United States. (Source: Official figures of the U. S. Department of Commerce.)

Fact No. 2: Prices for consumers during that same year have soared 19 percent. (Source: Official figures of the U. S. Department of Commerce.)

Fact No. 3: Wages for labor advanced only 14 percent during the same year—and in some fields much less or not at all. (Source: Official figures of the U. S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

Fact No. 4: Savings of American individuals during the same year have dropped to the lowest level since 1941 and to half the amount saved in 1945. (Source: Official figures of the U. S. Securities and Exchange Commission.)

The whole story is right there. American labor, at the peak of its productivity, finds more and more of the wealth it creates going out into profits. Meanwhile, its own cost of staying alive is shooting skyward. At the same time it is being cut off from its financial and psychological anchor—security in the form of savings.

Let's retrace a bit. Department of Commerce figures for 1946, now assembled for the first time, show an all-time high in profits of $12,000,000,000, after taxes have been paid. Thus far in 1947 profits are piling up even faster, at the rate of $15,000,000,000 a year after taxes.

Now let's have a look at the official figures on the prices the average consumer pays. In the 9 months since OPA controls have been abolished, food and farm products skyrocketed 48 percent on the wholesale level, while other commodities jumped 44 percent.

Translated on the retail level, where the average consumer must buy, the figures show that meat bounced up 46.8 percent in those 9 months. Butter and other fats and oils went up 59.3 percent, dairy products 24 percent, and clothing 20 percent.

Labor is striking or threatening to strike, because profits have gone up 34 percent, prices 19 percent, and wages only 14 percent. It's as simple as that, especially if you defrost these cold figures and try to see them as they leave their impact on the daily living of the average American family.

It must be clear to every thoughtful American that we will be stumbling our way into a major disaster if the present trends are continued. Fortunately there is some hope that the more far-sighted leaders of business and industry are beginning to spot the booby traps along the course on which they are embarked. The Ford Motor Co. has announced a cut in prices. The Chrysler Corp. followed suit with an announcement last week that it is going to reduce the cost on Plymouths.

Perhaps even more significant were the statements of two outstanding businessmen, one a manufacturer, the other a merchant. Said Don G. Mitchell, president of the Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.: "Too large a segment of industry is still willing to make as much as you can while you can, a policy that can lead only to disaster."

Jack Straus, president of R. H. Macy & Co., New York, bought full-page advertising space to warn consumers against buying indiscriminately, to plead for lower prices, and to advocate a slash in profits. "We are all going to have to reduce our profit margins," he said. Profits, "in many industries, including our own, were abnormally high in 1946, based on consumer sales."

The head of the world's largest department store put his finger on the most urgent need in the American economy today—and incidentally on the cause of labor-management conflict—when he said that improved efficiency must be translated into lower prices rather than into higher profits if we are to have continuing prosperity. High production must be the basis for high wages. Our economy can be supported only by high production and high wages.

Mr. Straus is dead right, of course, and yet every official figure shows we are now pursuing the reverse course.

BILL DENIES ORGANIZATIONAL RIGHTS TO 3,500,000 WORKERS

It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, that this bill undertakes to repeal or nullify or emasculate the National Labor Relations Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and union protection under the Clayton Act—this bill undertakes to prohibit unionization of three and a half million workers, and to deprive them of their constitutional rights, of their implicit right of association, of their right to seek security and a more abundant way of life.

I am referring to the provisions in this bill that woul deny to supervisory employees peaceful machinery for settling their problems with their employer.

It seems to me that a more comprehensive study should be made of the terms and conditions of employment of supervisory employees to determine whether or not they are justified in their demands that the full protection and benefits of the National Labor Relations Act applies to them. For example, how many of us know how many cases have been presented to the National Labor Relations Board by foremen who have been discriminated against by their employer? Does the Labor Committee have full knowledge of such pertinent information before considering this legislation?

We are all aware that foremen are organizing into unions for their own mutual aid and protection. We are also aware that employers are vigorously protesting lawful protection of supervisory employees' rights on the grounds that foremen are management, and as such cannot have a dual allegiance. It seems to me that this matter has been given very thorough and serious study, not only by the National Labor Relations Board, but by the Supreme Court of the United States. Just recently our highest tribunal decided that supervisory employees are definitely entitled to the benefits and protection of law. Can we, therefore, cast aside their rights? I believe that if I were employed in a supervisory capacity by any employer who dealt unfairly with me that I, too, would seek the protection from the Congress of the United States that is offered to all workers. After all, foremen are workers too. And, can we therefore deprive a large segment of our working population of the same rights that we offer to the rest?

FOREMEN SHOULD BE ALLOWED UNIONS

I say that foremen should be permitted to have their own organization

for their own mutual aid and protection. That they are seeking such protection through organization cannot be denied; for in the past several years thousands of them have banded together in an effort to establish equitable conditions of employment for themselves.

The history of labor in our country has established a clear and concise record of supervisory employees participating in union activities in many of our great industries. For example, building trades, typographical, maritime, and our great railroad industry have always recognized the right of supervisors to have their own union and bargain collectively. Why then should we deny to others the same privilege and right that we have recognized and granted for the past 50 years to the supervisors in the industries I just mentioned?

CONGRESS INTENDED TO PRESERVE THIS RIGHT

There has been much debate on the question of whether or not Congress intended to include supervisory employees in the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act providing for employee-rights. It seems to me that the father of the act, Senator ROBERT WAGNER, in his debate on the floor of the Senate last year set forth clearly his intentions in offering to foremen the same benefits and protection offered to other workers, when he said—and I quote:

Mr. President, I understand that the question with which we are dealing is now pending in court. I believe that the subject about which we are asked to legislate is the very subject over which we fought several years ago. The issue then was, shall the workers have the right to organize and bargain collectively? Foremen are also workers. What we are now being asked to say to the foremen is, "No; you may not organize. If your employer does not want you to have a union, you may not organize." As I have said, we fought over that issue some years ago when the so-called Wagner Act was first before the Congress. Supervisors are not a part of management; but it is now proposed to say to them, "You may not be protected under the so-called Wagner Act because you are foremen. You are not ordinary workers. You may not have anything to say about your wages. You have no right to bargain collectively." We fought out that very issue back in 1933, and we thought it was settled. The employer said to the employee, "No; you may not belong to a union." We were compelled to enact legislation so as to permit the workers to organize.

Continuing, Senator WAGNER said:

Senators may do as they please, but if they vote for the amendment they will say to many foremen and supervisors, "No; you have no legal protection. You have no right to bargain collectively. You have no right to carry on collective bargaining with your employer with reference to what your wages, hours or anything else shall be." Senators, if we do that I say that we are returning to the old days.

I am particularly opposed to the provisions of this bill that will deny to supervisory employees lawful protection in their efforts to secure wages and terms and conditions of employment that are fair. I feel that we will err in passing upon this matter of such importance to 3,500,000 workers at this time, and therefore recommend that a more comprehensive study be made of this particular problem, so that we can act with justification based upon facts.

REPUBLICANS HAVE VOTES TO ADOPT RULE AND PASS BILL

Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that you have the votes in the House necessary to adopt this rule and to force through this drastic and ill-considered bill, even to the extent of being able to defeat every amendment designed to mitigate its harsh and unwarranted provisions.

Nevertheless, I am satisfied that if the Republican membership were free to act according to conscience and not bound by the action of your party caucus and the whip of the powerful and short-sighted interests behind this bill, many would reject this extremely harsh and unfortunate bill which soon will be stuffed down the throats of the Members of this House.

I feel sure that when the votes are cast there will not be a single Republican vote against this rule, and that the Republican vote for the bill will be very nearly unanimous. Of course, they will be joined by some gentlemen from this side who are unfriendly to labor, who have no organized labor in their districts, and who will be swayed by the high-pressure and dishonest campaign carried on for many, many years against organized labor, and whipped up to a new and degrading fever in recent months.

SPIRIT OF LABOR CANNOT BE THUS BROKEN

But notwithstanding that you will, by passing this bill, wreak your long-nourished vengeance against the American workingman and his family, and thus express your contempt for the democratic processes on which the American way of life is soundly founded, I now prophesy that you will not break the spirit of American labor.

To the contrary, I predict that by this senseless action you will give American labor new inspiration to renew the age-long fight for justice and equality and freedom; to work together in harmonious cooperation to preserve their self-respect; and to expand their membership and their influence as the unorganized majority of workers begin to realize more fully their lack of protection against unjust and vengeful attacks on their economic and political rights.

Mr. Speaker, they will be fighting for their very existence. They will be fighting to prevent their being forced back into medieval serfdom, into the slavery of working 10 and 12 hours a day for a pittance of a dollar a day; into the horrors of the sweatshop, where women worked long hours for 75 cents a day, and children of tender age worked by their sides for 25 cents a day.

All workers, organized and unorganized, will be forced to the realization that you are legislating in the interest of those who have, against those who have not.

DESTROYING FARM PROSPERITY

You are destroying the farmers' markets for their high-priced foodstuffs. When the crash comes—and if this bill becomes law the crash will come as surely as night follows day, and winter follows summer and the moon follows the sun—the leaders of rich and arrogant farm organizations will not be able to deliver the farm vote to you.

Farmers are shrewd and understanding. They, too, can read their magazines and newspapers—and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

They will remember then that it was under a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress that they were rescued from the Republican-made Hoover depression; they will remember that it was the "despised New Deal" which brought to them the highest prices in history, and the highest spread between what they can sell their products for, and what they have to pay out. They will remember that it was the Democratic administrations under Wilson and Roosevelt which pulled them out of despair and hopelessness, and enacted beneficial laws to enable them to save their soil, to save on interest, to save their homes and their means of making a living. They will come to realize—as labor already realizes—that selfish forces of black reaction lie behind this bill, inspired only by greed and profit.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that those on the Republican side have neither eyes to see nor ears to hear nor hearts to understand what has taken place in the minds of the American people; but remember, when election time comes again, it will be your funeral, not mine. I feel that this legislation, aiming to cripple labor and destroy business, will not be enacted because the American people will not stand for it and will not approve of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Could you not answer one question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I now yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because I am opposed to the consideration of this legislation. I think that any person who believes in collective bargaining must acknowledge the fact that there cannot be any collective bargaining without some sort of equality on both sides. The only people who do not sincerely believe in collective bargaining, both in business and outside of business, are those who would establish some form of Fascist control of labor in these United States. I believe the average businessman, the person who has at heart the welfare of the country and believes in the advancement of its economy, absolutely adheres to the proposition that you cannot have industrial relationship conducive to the welfare of the Nation without collective bargaining. A study of the history of collective bargaining and how it came about demonstrates conclusively that only as equality for labor is established can collective bargaining become a reality. The history of labor is a story of struggle by the American worker to achieve equality through unionization and that whatever equality he has been able to obtain in his relationship with

industry has been obtained only after years of struggle, struggle of the most excruciating kind. Labor has been subjected to the worst kind of exploitation. The only way the workers could protect themselves in some measure against it was to organize and form unions. That is, unions free from company control. In the beginning it was craft unions. Then, to achieve more effective unity, industrial unionization was attempted and carried out by the CIO.

Now, what does this legislation do? This legislation wipes out whatever strength organized labor acquired to bring about equality in bargaining. Any honest analysis of the bill will demonstrate that to be correct. It wipes out completely any semblance of equality on the part of labor in bargaining with industry. It destroys completely the bargaining power of organized labor to sit down at the table with the employers and seek redress against exploitation. You cannot bargain unless you have power. Labor cannot have power except through unionization. Union activities such as have been laid down in the Wagner Act, protected by the Norris-LaGuardia Act, put on the statutes, for the sole purpose of granting to American workers who are organized, equality in bargaining—all that is being wiped out by this legislation. Distort the truth as much as you can but you cannot get away from that.

What is your justification for this legislation? Oh, you say you are going to give certain rights, a new bill of rights to the American worker. What are you giving him? What are those rights? You are shearing him of his strength, strength which exists only because of unionization, unity on the part of the workers protecting him against yellow-dog contracts, company unions, low wages, long hours, and indecent working conditions. You are taking that protection away from him and thus you leave him completely at the mercy of the big monopolies of this country. So you are giving him the right to do what? To become once again a wage slave. You are giving him the right to be free, freeing him from unionization, freeing him from his hard-earned protection, freeing him from his union, his only defense against exploitation. You are making him free to be exploited. You are making him free to be forced to work for lower wages. You are making him free to be forced to work long hours. You are making him free and impotent to defend himself against any attempt by industry to subject him to the same working conditions that existed in these United States 75 years ago. You are giving him the freedom to become enslaved to a system that has been repudiated in the past not only by Democrats but also by outstanding progressive-minded Republicans. You are giving him freedom to be subjected to the injunction, to the yellow-dog contract, to company unions, to the vilest form of exploitation. In the name of freedom and a new bill of rights you destroy his rights, his unions, his strength, and his real freedom. You may pass this legislation, but you will not fool American wage earners. They know that their union and their rights that you now seek to destroy have been and are their best guarantee and bill of rights for freedom and economic security.

The whole philosophy of industrial relationship based on equality of bargaining is destroyed by this legislation. You say that you are going to do this to get rid of the Communists in the unions, to get rid of the racketeers. Let us see Under the guise of fighting communism you are with this legislation advancing fascism on American labor. That is just what you are doing, and again, you cannot get away from it.

Now about this talk of racketeering, let us see who are the real racketeers. When we consider the spiraling in prices, the spiraling of the cost of living which has increased 50 percent since last June, we find that the real racketeers are the gentlemen who asked for free enterprise in order to raise prices. By free enterprise they meant freedom to charge whatever prices they pleased and to pay whatever wages they wanted to pay. That is the kind of free enterprise which was urged by these gentlemen upon the United States in the last election; and these same people who used the cry of free enterprise and who are now taking out of the pockets of the American consumers millions and millions of dollars are behind this legislation. They are the real racketeers. They made billions and billions of dollars in wartime. Now these are the men who are destroying the purchasing power of the American people and seek to destroy the rights of American workers. They are the real racketeers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield to me, I will yield him two additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Certainly I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for four additional minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am not greatly surprised that the gentleman from New York is opposed to this bill, but I will be greatly surprised if the great majority of my good friends on that side of the aisle oppose it, inasmuch as President Truman himself said that something must be done; that we must have some labor bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois that I opposed the President's proposal at the time he came here during the railroad strike. But that is neither here nor there. Let us judge this legislation by just what it is.

As I was saying, these big monopolies that have been taking millions and millions of dollars out of the pockets of the American consumers are the ones who want this legislation. They are the ones who today make it impossible for labor to bargain. They are the ones who are today adamant in their refusal to negotiate agreements on wages and hours and refuse to give the American worker a wage with which he can keep up with the increasing cost of living. They want this legislation and they support it from A to Z in order to continue to deprive Americans of their share of the peace.

May I say to the gentleman from Illinois who asked about gentlemen on this side a while ago, that the gentleman from Illinois cannot point out a single opponent of this bill among the big trusts that have been profiteering and racketeering—wholesale racketeering, that is what it amounts to—the worst kind of racketeering, increasing the cost of living at the expense of the American consumers.

Did anyone of them ever come out against this kind of legislation? No. They have paid out millions of dollars to put in advertisments supporting it. They have issued tons of literature for it. They have their radio commentators, columnists, and the press busily engaged smearing labor. All of them have been drumming the war drums against the men and women of America whose only crime has been to try to obtain for themselves and their families a decent standard of living.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I want to pay tribute to the gentleman as an expert on what constitutes racketeering.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is a much better expert on that than I am.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. As a matter of fact, I think the gentleman qualifies eminently as an expert on that subject.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman knows what a racketeer is, and in his own district, too.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. My district is just as good, if not better, than the gentleman's district and I am mighty proud of my district. My district is a district of homes, schools, churches, and workers whose people gave their sons for freedom but do not go around bragging about it. You cannot meet the issues and you drag out a red herring.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I will identify the red herring, too.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. The gentleman cannot identify anything. I, however, have identified the real racketeers and it is obvious that the gentleman is very sensitive over it. I repeat, you are drawing a red herring in order to escape from the real consequences that this bill imposes on the working people of this country. You are parroting the same tactics that are employed by the National Association of Manufacturers.

I would like to know how much collaboration the authors of this legislation have received from the attorneys of the National Association of Manufacturers and the so-called experts employed by that organization, all enemies not only of labor but as a result of their practices, their racketeering practices, real enemies of the economy of these United States.

This legislation is a part of a pattern. It is part of the pattern of boom, bust, and war, and in the face of that condition which you have been creating your only answer is Fascist labor legislation. Send to the Library for the Fascist syndicate

laws enacted by Mussolini after he came into power; compare those laws with what you are enacting here, and the similarity is striking, the similarity is such that it is sufficient to frighten anyone in America who believes in American democracy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to say that with this legislation we are marching, as Philip Murray correctly stated, toward fascism. You cannot have a free America without free labor unions; you cannot have free labor unions when you deprive the American labor unions of their fundamental rights. You cannot have free labor unions when you deprive the American labor unions of their power to bargain collectively. You cannot have free labor unions when you destroy the strength of free labor unions to obtain equality in bargaining. That is what you are doing with this legislation. You think you are going to get votes by it, you may think you will sweep an election by it, but I tell you that the day is not far off in these United States when the American people will recognize the pattern of boom, bust, and war that you are trying to put over on them under the guise of fighting so-called communism, and so-called racketeers. You are putting over fascism in these United States and again you cannct get away from that no matter how gross the distortion, no matter how big the lie.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a moment ago that I was not surprised that my good friend from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is opposed to this rule. As I stated previously, this rule is an open one. It provides that the majority Members of this body, together with the minority, can pass such labor legislation as they desire. I bring to the gentleman's attention that on January 6, in the President's message to Congress in regard to labor, he mentions certain labor-management problems, and I quote:

> Certain labor-management problems need attention at once and certain others, by reason of their complexity, need exhaustive investigation and study.
>
> We should enact legislation to correct certain abuses and to provide additional governmental assistance in bargaining. But we should also concern ourselves with the basic causes of labor-management difficulties.
>
> In the light of these considerations, I propose to you and urge your cooperation in effecting the following four-point program to reduce industrial strife:
>
> Point No. 1 is the early enactment of legislation to prevent certain unjustifiable practices.
>
> First, under this point, are jurisdictional strikes. In such strikes the public and the employer are innocent bystanders who are injured by a collision between rival unions. This type of dispute hurts production, industry, and the public—and labor itself. I consider jurisdictional strikes indefensible.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Another form of interunion disagreement is the jurisdictional strike involving the question of which labor union is entitled to perform a particular task. When rival unions are unable to settle such disputes themselves, provision must be made for peaceful and binding determination of the issues.
>
> A second unjustifiable practice is the secondary boycott, when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act.
>
> * * * * *
>
> A third practice that should be corrected is the use of economic force, by either labor or management, to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts.

That is the President of the United States saying we need some labor legislation. The gentleman from New York obviously will vote against this rule. He does not even want to consider any labor legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The President in his message also stated, and I quote:

> We must not, under the stress of emotion, endanger our American freedoms by taking ill-considered action which will lead to results not anticipated or desired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Rules and his associates for bringing this proposal before the House under an open rule. I know that some people said before that rule was granted that it was proposed to bring the measure before the House with a closed rule that would prohibit amendment. However, is this not the situation? Under the rule presently before us and which will shortly be adopted, amendments are in order so long as they are germane. It is in order for the House, sitting in the Committee of the Whole, to take such action as it deems proper in respect to this bill. The House can act as it sees fit on any of these provisions. So the issue that will come on the vote on the rule simply is, Shall we proceed to the consideration of legislation having to do with labor-management relations—legislation, I may say, overwhelmingly demanded by a majority of the people of this country and, as the gentleman from Illinois has just pointed out, even suggested, in part at least, by the President of the United States?

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. Yes, but the gentleman forgot to say that the President asked for a commission, representatives of both Houses and the public, to make a long, extensive research and study, which has not been given by this Congress up to now. Even this bill before us has been the subject only of a very inadequate study.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I understand the Labor Committee, for at least 6 weeks, from early morning until late at night, has been holding hearings, and that they brought before them leaders of organized labor, and that the hearings were very extensive.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the present consideration of this bill, and I think I can answer the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the committee, in this way: As a member of the Committee on Labor, I can definitely state that we have not adequately studied this problem of labor-management relations. Certainly, hearings were held, but this bill was being written—and I will tell you in a minute by whom—while these hearings were held; and, in fact, it was begun before the hearings were started. The chairman of our committee—and I have great respect for him and high regard—stated publicly during the course of these hearings that the bill was being prepared, and explained at that time, in the early stages of the hearings, just what the bill would contain. President Truman's suggestion that a committee should be appointed to fully study the problem is an excellent one and should be followed.

Mr. Speaker, some monopolistic corporations are trying to get the American people to believe that labor has become a monopoly, and therefore is threatening the country. They are really trying, and trying desperately, to disguise what the Senate Small Business Committee calls the alarming growth of monopolies in business.

In the auto industry, the great symbol of American enterprise, of 1,200 companies that have been in business, only 12 remain. Of these 12, 3—Ford, Chrysler, and GM—do 90 percent of the business. These three control the policies of the entire industry.

The Secretary of Commerce said in June of 1946:

> Since VJ-day there has been a sharp increase in corporate mergers and acquisition of small firms by larger ones.

Who coined this slogan "labor monopolies"? It was coined by John W. Scoville, formerly with the Chrysler Corp., now with the Committee for Constitutional Government. This committee, financed by Pew, du Pont, and other NAM leaders, brags that the slogan was adopted as part of a careful plan against unions:

> Our first step was to coin a slogan, as we had coined "court packing," "purge," "one-man rule," each of which swept across the country and led to victory over public menaces.

The committee's new slogan is "labor monopolies," which was projected into the title selected for John Scoville's book. Copies of the book, Labor Monopolies, were sent to all Members of Congress with an offer for 100 free copies to distribute to their constituents. It was mailed to public officials in every State.

The CCG propaganda uses the big lie to cover the fact that free competitive enterprise is rapidly becoming a thing of the past. Small business is being squeezed out. Profits are higher than ever before, and going up—wages are going down. Prices continue to rise. Rent control is being killed. The Amer-

ican worker's standard of living is seriously threatened.

This is a threat to our American way of life. Our unions stand as the strongest bulwark for economic and political democracy because, without strong unions, our economy will collapse, through further drops in wages and purchasing power. After World War I, the same lopsided picture took shape. The unions were weakened, and we went into a severe depression.

The present drive against labor does not represent the wishes or thinking of many Members of Congress, including certain members of the House Labor Committee.

The new House labor bill was not written with the help of the Democratic members of the committee. In fact, they were not consulted and no full committee meetings were held to discuss it. The bill was actually written with the help of several industry representatives and some lawyers from the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce. Some of the most valuable assistance came from William Ingles, who reports a $24,000 annual salary as a lobbyist.

Ingles represents Allis-Chalmers Co., Fruehauf Trailer Co., J. I. Case Co., the Falk Corp., and Inland Steel Co. These are not the only antiunion companies that are helping out the Labor Committee. Patrioteer Theodore R. Iserman put aside his rich Chrysler law practice for two full weeks to help out the House committee.

Another volunteer in the antilabor cause is Jerry Morgan, whose law offices in Washington serve a variety of big corporations.

This group of high-priced lawyers quietly worked up the most vicious bill yet produced. The Democratic members were ignored. For 2 weeks no committee meeting was called.

Then the threatened telephone strike was announced. The distinguished chairman of the Labor Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], called the reporters. He said, in effect, a majority of the committee had approved a bill to stop the telephone strike. He added that if the strike were called off the bill would not be pushed.

The Hartley bill to break the telephone strike is based on Mr. HARTLEY's desire "to protect the public health, safety, and interest," but the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] and his Republican colleagues voted to wipe out the only Federal agency dealing with safety—the Bureau of Labor Standards. They fought every health bill, and most of them even fought the school-lunch program. To show how far this thinking can go, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] cited a strike of magazine bindery workers which could be stopped by the same bill because the strike affected communications, which are, of course, vital to public safety.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there is only one issue involved in the vote on this rule, and that is simply whether or not the Members favor considering legislation to deal with labor problems. The record is clear as to why we have this problem on our doorstep yet. It is because the bill which the Congress passed last year was vetoed and the problem was not met.

Behind the action that the Congress took last year you had a record of the President of the United States calling for legislation back in the fall of 1945. The President called a labor-management conference here in Washington. The Members of the House were told, "Do not press for legislation until this voluntary conference has had an opportunity to show what it can work out."

The President came before the Congress with a special message on the 3d of December in 1945 and told us that the objectives of the conference had not been reached, and he asked the Congress to pass legislation. He made three specific recommendations. That matter was considered by the committees of the two Houses. We had not taken action at Christmas time. The President went before the country on the radio on the 3d of January 1946 and said to the people of the country, "You want action. While the Members of Congress are home on their vacation, tell them what you want is some action on this, and, if they do not like my recommendations, to write their own bill." The Congress proceeded to write its bill and we passed it, and then the President did not like that, and vetoed the bill.

Someone talks about free labor. The President came here in one of those crises which arose because we do not have any machinery to meet that kind of a situation and asked for the drafting of labor in the railway strike. Is that freedom for labor?

These crises came back to face us and to plague the country as they are now in the telephone strike, because Congress has not met the problem, or, if we did meet it, then the President was not ready to go along with us.

This is our opportunity today to consider comprehensive legislation under an open rule that will permit any germane amendment.

Of course, this rule should be adopted by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 47, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—319

Abernethy	Arnold	Boggs, La.
Albert	Auchincloss	Bolton
Allen, Calif.	Bakewell	Bonner
Allen, Ill.	Banta	Boykin
Allen, La.	Barden	Bradley, Calif.
Almond	Barrett	Bradley, Mich.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bates, Mass.	Bramblett
Anderson, Calif.	Beall	Brehm
Andresen, August H.	Beckworth	Brooks
Andrews, Ala.	Bell	Brown, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bennett, Mich.	Brown, Ohio
Angell	Bennett, Mo.	Bryson
Arends	Bishop	Buck
	Blackney	Buffett
	Boggs, Del.	Bulwinkle
Burke	Harness, Ind.	Norman
Burleson	Harris	Norrell
Busbey	Harrison	O'Hara
Butler	Hartley	O'Konski
Byrnes, Wis.	Hays	Owens
Camp	Hébert	Pace
Canfield	Hendricks	Passman
Cannon	Herter	Patterson
Carson	Heselton	Peden
Case, N. J.	Hess	Peterson
Case, S. Dak.	Hill	Phillips, Calif.
Chadwick	Hinshaw	Phillips, Tenn.
Chapman	Hobbs	Pickett
Chelf	Hoeven	Ploeser
Chenoweth	Hoffman	Potts
Chiperfield	Holmes	Preston
Church	Hope	Price, Fla.
Clason	Horan	Priest
Clements	Howell	Ramey
Clevenger	Jackson, Calif.	Rankin
Coffin	Jarman	Redden
Cole, Kans.	Jenison	Reed, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Jenkins, Pa.	Rees
Cooper	Jensen	Reeves
Corbett	Johnson, Calif.	Rich
Cotton	Johnson, Ill.	Richards
Courtney	Johnson, Ind.	Riehlman
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Riley
Cravens	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Crow	Jones, Ohio	Robertson
Cunningham	Jones, Wash.	Robsion
Curtis	Jonkman	Rockwell
Dague	Kean	Rogers, Fla.
D'Alesandro	Kearney	Rogers, Mass.
Davis, Ga.	Kearns	Rohrbough
Davis, Tenn.	Keating	Ross
Deane	Keefe	Russell
Devitt	Kerr	Sadlak
D'Ewart	Kersten, Wis.	St. George
Dingell	Kilburn	Sanborn
Dirksen	Kilday	Sarbacher
Dolliver	Knutson	Sasscer
Domengeaux	Kunkel	Schwabe, Mo.
Dondero	Landis	Schwabe, Okla.
Dorn	Lanham	Scott. Hugh D., Jr.
Doughton	Larcade	Scrivner
Drewry	Latham	Seely-Brown
Durham	Lea	Shafer
Elliott	LeCompte	Sheppard
Ellis	LeFevre	Sikes
Ellsworth	Lemke	Simpson, Ill.
Elsaesser	Lewis	Smathers
Elston	Lodge	Smith, Kans.
Engel, Mich.	Love	Smith, Ohio
Engle, Calif.	Lucas	Smith, Wis.
Evins	Lyle	Springer
Fellows	McConnell	Stefan
Fenton	McCowen	Stevenson
Fernandez	McDonough	Stigler
Fisher	McDowell	Stratton
Flannagan	McGarvey	Sundstrom
Fletcher	McGregor	Taber
Folger	McMillan, S. C.	Taylor
Foote	McMillen, Ill.	Teague
Forand	MacKinnon	Thomas, N. J.
Gallagher	Macy	Thomas, Tex.
Gamble	Mahon	Thomason
Gary	Maloney	Tibbott
Gathings	Manasco	Towe
Gavin	Martin, Iowa	Trimble
Gearhart	Mason	Twyman
Gillette	Mathews	Van Zandt
Gillie	Meade, Ky.	Vinson
Goff	Meade, Md.	Vursell
Gore	Meyer	Wadsworth
Gossett	Michener	Walter
Graham	Miller, Conn.	Weichel
Granger	Miller, Md.	West
Grant, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.	Wheeler
Gregory	Mills	Whitten
Griffiths	Mitchell	Whittington
Gross	Monroney	Wigglesworth
Gwinn, N. Y.	Morris	Williams
Gwynne, Iowa	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Hagen	Morton	Wilson, Tex.
Hale	Muhlenberg	Winstead
Hall, Leonard W.	Murdock	Wolcott
Halleck	Murray, Tenn.	Wolverton
Hand	Murray, Wis.	Youngblood
Hardy	Nixon	Zimmerman
Harless, Ariz.	Nodar	
	Norblad	

NAYS—47

Blatnik	Fulton	Kelley
Buchanan	Gordon	Kennedy
Carroll	Gorski	King
Celler	Havenner	Kirwan
Crosser	Hedrick	Klein
Delaney	Heffernan	Lane
Donohue	Holifield	Lesinski
Douglas	Huber	McCormack
Eberharter	Jackson, Wash.	Madden
Feighan	Karsten, Mo.	Mansfield, Mont.
Fogarty	Kee	

Marcantonio	O'Toole	Rabin
Miller, Calif.	Pfeifer	Sabath
Morgan	Philbin	Sadowski
Norton	Powell	Somers
O'Brien	Price, Ill.	Welch

NOT VOTING—66

Bates, Ky.	Grant, Ala.	Rayburn
Battle	Hall,	Rayfiel
Bender	Edwin Arthur	Rizley
Bland	Hart	Rooney
Bloom	Hull	Scoblick
Brophy	Javits	Scott, Hardie
Buckley	Jennings	Short
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Clark	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Maine
Clippinger	Judd	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Kefauver	Snyder
Combs	Keogh	Spence
Cooley	Lusk	Stanley
Coudert	Lynch	Stockman
Crawford	McMahon	Talle
Dawson, Ill.	Mansfield, Tex.	Tollefson
Dawson, Utah	Merrow	Vail
Eaton	Mundt	Vorys
Fallon	Patman	Wood
Fuller	Plumley	Woodruff
Gerlach	Poage	Worley
Gifford	Poulson	
Goodwin	Rains	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Byrne of New York against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.

Mr. Gerlach for, with Mr. Poulson against.

Mr. McMahon for, with Mr. Bloom against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Bland.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Fogarty.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Cooley.

Mr. Merrow with Mr. Rains.

Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Worley.

Mr. Crawford with Mr. Colmer.

Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mrs. Lusk.

Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Short with Mr. Fallon.

Mr. Rizley with Mr. Clark.

Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. GORSKI, and Mr. GORDON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MUNITIONS CONTROL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 195)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a proposal for legislation to authorize supervision of the exportation of arms, ammunition, implements of war, and related commodities, and the importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war; to provide for the registration, under certain conditions, of manufacturers, exporters, importers, and certain dealers in munitions of war; and to provide for obtaining more adequate information concerning the international traffic in arms. The principal purpose of this proposal is to supersede the present provisions of law in section 12 of the Neutrality Act of November 4, 1939. For the reasons outlined below it is believed that the Congress will agree that this section of the present law is particularly ineffective in dealing with current problems and that the Congress will wish to take prompt action to enact a new law along the lines proposed herein.

Section 12 of the Neutrality Act provides for: the establishment of a National Munitions Control Board; the administration of the provisions of that section by the Secretary of State; the registration of those engaged in the business of manufacturing, importing, or exporting arms, ammunition, and implements of war; the conditions under which export and import licenses may be issued; the reports which the National Munitions Control Board shall make to the Congress; and the determination by the President of what articles shall be considered arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Reports of the activities carried on by the Department of State pursuant to section 12 for the years 1941 to 1946, inclusive, have been submitted to assist the Congress in its consideration of the legislation now suggested. Operations prior to 1941 are contained in the first to sixth Annual Reports of the National Munitions Control Board.

The proposed legislation contemplates continuing certain of the essential aspects of section 12 of the Neutrality Act, particularly those pertaining to the administrative framework of the controls now exercised. However, it is different in its objective and it proposes a more flexible and efficient administration.

The present system of supervising this country's international traffic and trade in arms and munitions of war was conceived during a period of neutrality and with the view to remaining out of war. To achieve this end the successive Neutrality Acts of 1935, 1937, and 1939 were founded on the principle of impartiality toward all who would secure munitions from us regardless of their motives. As long as section 12 of the Neutrality Act is in effect that requirement of impartiality is still the law and the Secretary of State must treat aggressor and aggrieved, peacemaker and troublemaker equally by granting every application for a license for the exportation of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war unless such action would be in violation of a treaty. Such a provision of law is no longer consistent with this country's commitments and requirements. We have committed ourselves to international cooperation through the United Nations. If this participation is to be fully effective this Government must have control over traffic in weapons which will permit us to act in accordance with our position in the United Nations and will be adaptable to changes in the international situation. Therefore, there must be new legal provisions enabling the exercise of discretion in the granting or rejecting of applications for export or import licenses for arms, ammunition, and implements of war and related items.

Weapons and implements of war are material weights in the balances of peace or war and we should not be legally bound to be indiscriminate in how they are placed in the scales. If war should ever again become imminent, it would be intolerable to find ourselves in our present position of being bound by our own legislation to give aid and support to any power which might later attack us. The proposed legislation is designed to permit in normal times of peace control over traffic in arms or other articles used to supply, directly or indirectly, a foreign military establishment, and in times of international crisis, to permit control over any article the export of which would affect the security interests of the United States.

The exercise of discretion necessarily requires a revision of the administration of the controls presently in operation. The suggested legislation provides for the exercise of discretion in the types of licenses which may be used, and in determining the activities which may be subject to registration. The new proposal differs from section 12 inasmuch as it permits the issuance of various types of licenses designed to take into account under what circumstances and in what quantities the export of the articles covered by the proposed bill should be subject to control. The purpose of this procedure is to permit freedom of trade in items of a purely commercial nature.

With regard to the registration requirements it should be noted that under the present law anyone engaged in manufacturing, exporting, or importing any of the articles defined as arms, ammunition or implements of war must register with the Secretary of State, whether the item handled by that person is a battleship or merely a .38-caliber pistol. Under the new proposal the President upon recommendation of the National Munitions Control Board may determine when the manufacture, exportation, or importation of any designated arms, ammunition, and implements of war shall require registration. This will mean that consideration may be given to the relative military significance of the item handled.

Another important change provides for obtaining fuller information which will be made available to the Congress in the reports of the National Munitions Control Board. With a number of agencies of this Government actively concerned with the disposal of arms and related items, the proposed legislation will allow for the amalgamation of all such information into one comprehensive report.

In addition to the foregoing, the proposed legislation differs from section 12 of the Neutrality Act by providing export controls over two additional categories; namely, (1) articles especially designed for or customarily used only in the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war and (2) articles exported for use, directly or indirectly, by a foreign military establishment.

With regard to item (1) it is certainly unsound to endeavor to regulate traffic in arms and ammunition and permit a free flow of the special machinery and tools used in the production of those arms and ammunition. In the absence

of such a provision those countries from whom munitions are withheld would soon seek and obtain the equipment with which to supply themselves.

In the interest of world peace articles supplying a foreign military establishment cannot be left free from Government supervision so far as exports are concerned. Prior to the last war there were no provisions for controlling articles supplying foreign military establishments. This condition must not be allowed to recur. The proposed legislation is consistent with the international trade policies I outlined a short time ago at Waco, Tex. It is designed to protect the security interests and to carry out the foreign policy of the United States.

There is one other aspect of the suggested legislation which warrants comment. At present there is no provision for supervising the activities of those persons who do not manufacture, import, or export arms, ammunition, and implements of war, but who, as free agents, buy or sell these items for export, or who obtain commissions or fees on contracts for manufacture or exportation of such items. These brokers assume none of the responsibilities of this important traffic, yet they promote it, often irresponsibly, and need only concern themselves with the profits to be found in the trade. It is scarcely fair to those who have the responsibility of carrying on what experience has shown to be a legitimate business, that such people should not be subject to regulation.

The international traffic in munitions and related items is a matter of major concern to us and to the other nations of the world. By such legislation as is now proposed for consideration by the Congress, the Government would be given powers essential for the safeguarding of its security interests in this international trade.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 15, 1947.*

[Enclosure: Report to the President from the National Munitions Control Board transmitting proposed bill.]

UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 32, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commisison the following Members of the House: Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming; Mr. BAKEWELL, of Missouri, and Mr. THOMAS, of Texas.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3020, with Mr. BROWN of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] is recognized for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] will be recognized for 3 hours.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the rule today, some rather unkind and unfair references have been made to the manner in which this bill has been drafted. This bill was written by the House Committee on Education and Labor. Those of us on the majority side accept full responsibility for what is in this bill. It was our responsibility in the first place and I think we have fulfilled that responsibility.

This committee, as everyone present knows, made the most exhaustive study and held the most exhausive hearings on this most complicated matter that have ever been held by any Committee on Labor in the history of the Congress of the United States. After the bill was prepared it was presented to the entire committee. It was read line by line and section by section, and no member of the committee was denied the right to amend it in any way he saw fit.

I would also like to make one brief response to the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] echoing the statement of the president of the CIO and his reference to fascism. As far as I am personally concerned, I am getting sick and tired of hearing those who are not Communists called Fascists. It is too bad that today, if you do not happen to follow the party line, if you do not happen to be a Communist, you have to sit and listen to the charge that if you are not a Communist you must be a Fascist, per se.

We are ready to defend this bill. I am going to, briefly, in a general way, recite what is in the bill. Following me, members of the committee will present in detail all features of the bill.

First, this bill outlaws the closed shop and monopolistic industry-wide bargaining. Now, I know there are those who are not quite pleased with the ban on industry-wide bargaining. I recognize that there undoubtedly will be some dislocations as a result of that particular feature, but I want to ask the membership of this House if we are going to be more concerned about some dislocations in one branch of industry than we are with meeting Mr. John L. Lewis face to face on the 1st of July, and whether we do not want to save this Nation from having its entire economy prostrated as a result of the domination of one man over the entire coal industry or any other industry.

Do we want to promote the tragic situation that this Nation faced last November and December? Or are we going to have the courage to meet the issue and try to settle it as best we can?

I may say to the membership of this House that no one claims this bill is perfect in every particular, and I may also add that I hardly believe there is another Member of the House who likes the bill in all its particulars. This bill is an unusual bill, may I say, in that it is most controversial in whole, and it is controversial in lesser or greater degree in all its parts; but may I suggest that any attempt to open this bill up when it is read under the 5-minute rule or to emasculate it will do more harm than good.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this time?

Mr. HARTLEY. I will yield for a brief question.

Mr. PACE. It would be helpful if the gentleman would point out the particular section of this bill which provides for the closed shop. I have had some difficulty in reconciling the different provisions.

Mr. HARTLEY. That is section 8 (a) 3. Other members of the committee will explain the provisions of the bill in detail; I am merely attempting to cover the bill in a general way.

This bill also exempts supervisors from the compulsory features of the National Labor Relations Act. In other words, this bill does not bar them from organizing but they cannot obtain the benefits of the act. It was quite apparent to us from the evidence we received in the committee that there was no such thing as an independent foremen's union; they were either identified with or controlled by the employee organizations composed of employees they were supposed to supervise.

This bill also imposes on both parties to labor disputes the duty of bargaining, and likewise it provides that in bargaining arrangements there must be a secret ballot by the employees on their employers' last offer of the settlement of a dispute. Why is this important? We find today, for example, there are over 900 strike notices on file in the United State Department of Labor. Under the terms of the Smith-Connally Act there has been built up a definite policy that whenever there is a collective consultation or conference to be held the members of the union automatically arm their leaders with a strike vote. This bill provides that that strike vote shall be taken after the members of the union know what the employers' best offer is and, therefore, be in a better position to decide whether or not they are satisfied and whether or not they wish to go out on strike.

This bill also provides for the removal of the present National Labor Relations Board and the substitution of a new board with different functions than those now possessed by the present Board. Every one of us who has studied the administration of the National Labor Relations Act knows that not only has it failed in many particulars because of its inherent weakness as a law, but it has failed in larger degree by the improper administration by the members of the Board and their subordinates. The National Labor Relations Board has been

investigator, prosecutor, jury, and judge all rolled into one. Under the pending bill we make it a quasi-judicial board which will pass on investigations and prosecutions that have been made by a separate administrator who is provided for in the bill. We further make it in order that these decisions shall be made on a preponderance of the evidence rather than on the fictitious evidence that has been permitted in times past by examiners of the Board.

This bill also protects the existence of labor organizations which are not affiliated with one of the national federations. It prohibits certification by the Board of labor organizations having Communist or subversive officers. If anyone doubts the need of that in the bill all you have to do is to read the testimony taken by our subcommittee in connection with the Allis-Chalmers strike in Milwaukee and you will understand that section of the bill is most in order.

This bill also outlaws the picketing of a place of business where the proprietor is not involved in a dispute with his employes. Mr. Chairman, why is that provision in order? Our committee has received and taken evidence all over the United States showing that in attempts to organize, yes, even a small grocery store, where perhaps every member employed in that grocery store were members of the same family, or in cases where only one or two employees were employed, picket lines were placed in front of the establishment even though there was no wage dispute involved at all.

We had a notable case of that in Oakland, Calif., where a paint manufacturer, a father and son corporation, employing only three persons, was approached by an organizer to organize the men in his establishment. He agreed to permit them to be organized and after they failed the organizer came to him and in spite of the fact that not one signed up demanded that the proprietor sign a closed-shop contract. This he declined to do. As a result a picket line was placed in front of his place of business. Now, this was a place of business employing only three persons. The picket line in this instance was not successful. What happened? The members of the paint-makers organization joined forces with the teamsters local and the teamsters refused to pick up or deliver any products of the paint maker. As a result he was forced to close his doors.

This bill also provides for unlawful concerted activities and it gives those persons injured thereby the right to sue civilly any person respcnsible therefor.

Why is that provision important in this bill? Let me cite cases of damages that have occurred by the hundreds, cases in California in particular, for instance, the case where milk by the thousands of gallons had to be poured down sewers or fed to hogs or destroyed because those teamsters called it "hot milk" and refused to handle it. In one instance their embargo, their refusal to handle this so-called hot milk, went to the ridiculous extreme of refusal to handle the milk because it came from cows that had been fed feed that had been delivered to the farm by a nonunion truck.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Was it not delivered by the farmer's own truck?

Mr. HARTLEY. It was delivered by the farmer's own truck. I am glad the gentleman referred to that.

We had a case where a lady who ran a turkey farm and was supporting an invalid husband, raised a certain number of turkeys every year. When it came time for them to be fattened and sent to the market she would call in her neighbors and for a nominal sum they would pluck the turkeys. They went to market but there could not be handled. Why? Because they had not been plucked by a union turkey plucker. Do you know how they finally met the situation? Finally they were permitted to be handled when a union turkey stamper stamped the birds one at a time and got something like 30 cents apiece for doing it. In the meantime this lady lost some $3,000 that year in her efforts to provide an income for herself and her family.

This bill provides that where such a condition exists a person who suffers damages may recover in the courts.

This bill also creates a new and independent conciliation agency. It removes the exemption of labor organizations from the antitrust laws when such organizations, acting either alone or in collusion with employers, engage in unlawful restraints of trade. It guarantees to employees and employers, and their respective representatives, the full exercise of the right of free speech. It provides a means of stopping strikes which imperil or threaten to imperil the public health, safety, or interest, and in that respect it provides that when the President finds that the public health or safety is threatened, that he shall authorize the Attorney General to seek an injunction in the courts, and if the courts so find that the public health or safety is imperiled, that the injunction shall be issued. Thereupon there follows a period of mediation if any agreement is reached, and if no settlement has been obtained that there shall be a following period of arbitration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

This bill also outlaws mass picketing and other forms of violence designed to prevent individuals from entering or leaving a place of business, and if you need any good reason for voting for that provision of the bill, all you have to do is to read the testimony of the Allis-Chalmers strike, of the mass picketing there, where there was bloodshed and violence. Also the mass picketing out in Hollywood, which has gone on intermittently for a period of over 2 years over a jurisdictional strike, where once again heads have been bashed in, bones broken, and all that sort of thing; and all you have to do to see what takes place is to see the press pictures of the demonstrations in the present telephone strike. Now, I would like to ask anyone of you here present, how you would like to attempt to go to work through a mass picket line such as I have exhibited by picture here in my hand. This provision barring mass picketing by the use of force and violence in the conduct of a strike is based on this premise: We do not want to interfere with the legitimate right to strike, but the committee holds that there is an equally fundamental right, and that is that any person has the right to go to work if he wants to work, and that he have that right free from any molestation on the part of anyone, be it a union or anyone else.

It makes labor organizations equally responsible with employers for contract violations and provides for suit by either against the other in the United States district courts.

It outlaws sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes, illegal boycotts, collusive strikes by employees of competing employers, as well as sit-down strikes, featherbedding, and other concerted interferences conducted by remaining on employer's premises. I want to say just a word about jurisdiction strikes. I heard the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle a little while ago refer to the high cost of living and the high cost of building. Now I want to give you a little reason why it is so hard to build a home today and why these costs are so high, and I want to call your attention to what is going on right now in my own State of New Jersey.

Up in New Jersey right at the present time there is between $45,000,000 and $50,000,000 worth of public housing at a total standstill not because of any question of hours and wages but simply because the carpenters say, "We want to carry the lumber from the trucks to the job," and the laborers say, "No, we want to carry it." As a result, nobody works, and that $45,000,000 to $50,000,000 worth of heavy construction is held up.

Are we acting against the interest of these individual carpenters and these individual laborers in providing an end to jurisdictional strikes? I say no, and I will tell you why I say no. I have had letters by the hundreds from carpenters and from laborers in the State of New Jersey who have said they want to go back to work. Both carpenters and laborers are satisfied to get back to work. But why is it they cannot? It is because Mr. Hutcheson, the head of the carpenters, and Mr. Moreschi, the head of the laborers here in Washington, have refused to get together and settle this jurisdictional dispute. They could do it overnight if they had the will to.

Mr. Green appeared before our committee and he pleaded as I have heard no one else plead. He said, "Do not interfere with the house of labor." Let me say to you that the house of labor is sick and is refusing to take any medicine itself. We believe that this House has to give it some medicine that will cure it of its own ills and restore the right to go back to work, that the rank and file of the labor movement really want.

It is not only heavy construction that is being held up in New Jersey today, it is the Federal Government's own building program to provide homes for returning veterans that is being held up be-

cause those projects, too, are at a standstill as the result of these jurisdictional strikes.

I want to point out something else. Representatives of three segments of the lumber industry appeared before our committee, the fir, the redwood, and another branch, and they pointed out that as a result of work stoppages, not concerning wages or hours but concerning jurisdictional strikes, closed-shop issues, and things of that kind, the production of sufficient lumber to build 210,000 6-room homes was lost. That is the reason for the high cost of building. It is not the high cost of building, it is the high cost of strikes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

This provision of the bill is also going to give us an opportunity to stop Mr. J. C. Petrillo from keeping American school children from going on the air. It is going to stop him from firing out of his union a man like Dr. Maddy, who was head of the Interlochen School, in Michigan, and who put on programs and trained youngsters throughout this Nation at their camp every year. It is going to meet face to face those high-handed dictatorial methods.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Idlewild Airport, a $90,000,000 project in New York, has been stopped from completion for a year because the telephone workers and the electrical workers are in a jurisdictional fight to determine which one shall do about 24 hours' worth of work in pulling a cable 1 mile.

Mr. HARTLEY. Exactly, and the instance the gentleman cites can be repeated ad infinitum all over this Nation.

In the year 1215, at Runnymede, King John delivered the Magna Carta, surrendering to the British barons sovereign power. In 1790, the Constitution of the United States gave to the common people of our country their Bill of Rights.

In 1935, the New Deal brought forth the National Labor Relations Act, rightly called another Magna Carta, and by it surrendered to the labor barons sovereign powers over the working man and woman of the United States. This year, this Congress gives to these working men and women their bill of rights.

And whom do we hear complaining of our purpose? The man at work? His family? His friends? No. We hear the labor barons, gathered in this city today more than 250 strong to fight this bill, the worker's bill of rights, with every weapon at their command.

Now let us see what is in this bill of rights. Let us see if it oppresses the workingman, or if it liberates him and gives him a voice, free of fear, in the affairs of a union that has over him the power that the National Labor Relations Act gives to his exclusive bargaining agent. This bill guarantees to him:

First. The right to join with the fellow workers to select a collective-bargaining agent of their own choosing, that is to say, one that is not forced upon them—sections 7 (a), 8 (a) (1), 8 (a) (3), 8 (b) (1), (9) (c) (2), 9 (f) (2), 9 (f) (4), 9 (f) (5).

Second. It gives him: The right to get a job without joining any union—sections 8 (a) (3), 8 (d) (4).

Third. The right to vote by secret ballot in a fair and free election on whether his employer and a union can make him join the union to keep his job—sections 8 (d) (4), 9 (g).

Fourth. The right to require the union that is his bargaining agent to represent him without discriminating against him in any way or for any reason, even if he is not a member of the union—section 8 (b) (2).

Fifth. The right with his fellow employees to make demands of their own, and to bargain about them through the leaders of their own local union, without dictation by national and international officers and representatives, and without regard to the demands of other employees upon other employers—section 9 (f) (1).

Sixth. The right to keep on working and getting his pay without sympathy strikes, jurisdictional disputes, illegal boycotts, and other disputes that do not involve him and his union or his employer—section 12 (a) (3) (a).

Seventh. The right to know what he is striking about before he is called out on strike, and to vote by secret ballot in a free and fair election on whether to strike or not after he has been told what his employer has offered him—section 2 (11).

Eighth. The right to express his opinion concerning union policies, union officers and candidates for union office, and to make and file charges against his employer, the union, or the union officers without suffering any penalty or discrimination—sections 8 (a) (4), 8 (c) (5).

Ninth. The right to vote by secret ballot without fear in free and fair elections on any matter of union policy—how much dues he shall pay, what assessments the union can make him pay, what the union can spend the money for—section 8 (c) (8).

Tenth. The right to vote by secret ballot in free and fair elections for his own choice of union officers—section 8 (c) (8).

Eleventh. The right to know how much money his union has, how much it pays its officers, and how much of the union's money the officers use for their expenses—section 8 (c) (10), 303.

Twelfth. The right to refuse to pay the union for any kind of insurance that he does not want—section 8 (c) (3).

Thirteenth. The right to receive his pay in his pay envelope, without the employer and the union spending it for him, checking it off for union dues or for other purposes—section 8 (a) (2) (C).

Fourteenth. The right to stay a member of a union, without being suspended or expelled, except for, first, not paying dues; second, disclosing confidential information of the union; third, violating the union's contract; fourth, being a Communist or fellow traveler; fifth, being convicted of a felony; sixth, engaging in disreputable conduct that reflects on the union—section 8 (c) (6).

Fifteenth. The right to be free of threats to his family for doing things in connection with union matters that an employer or a union does not like—section 8 (a) (1), 8 (b) (1), 12 (a) (1).

Sixteenth. The right to settle his own grievances with his employer—section 9 (a).

Seventeenth. The right without fear of reprisal, to support any candidate for public office that he chooses and to decide for himself whether or not his money will be spent for political purposes—section 8 (c) (5).

Eighteenth. The right to go to and from his work without being threatened or molested—section 12 (a) (1).

Nineteenth. The right of a union free of Communist domination and control, and one that is devoted to honest trade unionism and not class warfare and turmoil—section 9 (f) (6).

Twentieth. Every right to strike for any legitimate object that he has had under our laws since labor has had the right to strike.

Twenty-first. And, finally, the right to have a fair hearing, before an impartial board, without cost to himself, whenever he believes that any employer or any union is depriving him of these rights—section 10.

Besides all these rights, the bill preserves every essential right that the Labor Act in its present form guarantees to working people.

Now, is this oppressive? Is it punitive? Is it unfair? It is oppressive, if you wish to call it that, only to those union leaders who wish to exploit and degrade the people they represent, who wish to deprive them of a voice in matters that vitally concern them, to deprive them of free and fair elections within the union, and to control their political as well as their economic lives. Public opinion polls show that the overwhelming majority of the union members themselves approve reforms that we propose.

We are trying to make this labor bill a two-way proposition, we are trying to write equity into the law, to make the relationship between labor and management equitable, to place them on an equal basis. We are trying in this bill to reverse the trend that has been going on for some time, that is, to build up such terrible prejudices between management and labor. We are trying to stop this philosophy that the only way you can build up labor is to tear down management. We are trying to follow the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln on this particular subject when he said:

> Property is the fruit of labor. It is desirable. It is a positive good in the world. That some may be rich shows that others may become rich and, hence, is just encouragement for industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but rather let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus assuring that his own will be safe from violence when built.

That is the philosophy that permeates this bill.

In conclusion, may I say that there was a time when we increased wages and we reduced prices. Why were we able to do that? Because when we increased wages, we increased the productivity of

the average workman. But, later on, the philosophy changed, and it became the philosophy of "get as much as you can for doing as little as you can."

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] has a constituent who, in my opinion, has given us a new philosophy which everyone of us, whether we be in the labor movement, in management, or in the Halls of Congress, might well follow. I would like to leave it with you in closing. The philosophy which his constituent expresses is this: "To get more for the dollar you spend, give more for the dollar you earn." If we would all do that, I think the whole country would be better off, and we would be on our way toward real progress.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 24 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, after a careful study of H. R. 3020, it is my firm conviction that if the Congress should pass this bill it would take us back to the Dark Ages with respect to labor-management relations. Perhaps that is what it is meant to do—to take us back to the Dark Ages—back to the days of Republican normalcy. I can think of no better way to create the greatest degree of industrial strife this Nation has ever known than to enact this bill into law.

During the 170 years of this Nation's history, we have been made over from a nation of farmers and country dwellers into a nation three-fourths of whose people live in cities and work in industry. During the course of that 170 years, there have been many far-reaching, even fantastic, developments in industry. The employer of yesteryears who worked side by side with his hired man and served as a friendly counselor to his worker and his family is all but nonexistent today as far as the great mass of workers is concerned. The vast majority of workers today are machine tenders who do not know what the boss man or the chairman of the board of directors looks like.

During the 170 years we have come to recognize certain developments in industry as the labor movement. There have been troublesome times for both management and labor, but by and large it has been a struggle for recognition on the part of the wage earner and his family. This is pointed up in a 1943 report by the chairman of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on industrial and labor conditions entitled "The American Story of Industrial and Labor Relations." The chairman of that committee was IRVING M. IVES, now the junior Senator from the State of New York. On page 101 of that report there appears this paragraph:

> When the labor movement was growing rapidly at the end of the nineteenth century, many employers tried to prevent unions from being organized in their plants.

Then the report relates how some employers forced their workers to sign yellow-dog contracts, which, as you know, were agreements not to join or support a union while they worked for those employers. It describes another method used by some employers to fight the unions of that period, by blacklisting, which consisted simply of circulating among other employers the names of union members or those who were suspected of being union members. This particular scheme worked to the detriment of the unions because there were more workers than there were jobs, and it was risky to be affiliated with a labor union.

That was toward the close of the nineteenth century. Now during the present century our economy has grown by leaps and bounds, our industrial development has outstripped the dreams of the wildest visionary, until today our industrial know-how is unsurpassed the world over. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, our know-how in labor-management relations has not kept pace with our technological development.

Because our economy has expanded so rapidly and because practices, customs, and methods have changed so drastically in our huge industrial machine in such a short time, serious and often ugly labor-management problems have confronted us; some of those problems we have solved effectively in fairness to both management and labor; unfortunately, some of the problems still remain. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that there are remaining problems to be settled is no reason for going back to the Dark Ages or back to the days of Republican normalcy. And that is what I think this bill would do. I want to read an interesting sentence from a document which is probably familiar to a large part of this body. I refer to a little opus entitled "Textbook, Republican National Committee, 1940." On page 28 of that literary effort, under the title of Labor Relations, this is the leading paragraph:

> The Republican Party has always protected the American worker.

Now as I read an item in section 8 of House bill 3020, it would virtually nullify the check-off system under which employers automatically deduct union dues from employees' pay. This, gentlemen, is defined as an unfair practice on the part of the employers. And I suppose that is done in all faith with respect to the statement in the 1940 textbook:

> The Republican Party has always protected the American worker.

Now as I read another item in section 8 of the bill, it would outlaw employer contributions to any funds over which a union had any control at all, including those jointly administered by the union and the employer. Such a contribution by the employer would be an unfair labor practice. If, however, an employer should want to establish a fund over which the union would have no control, he could do so. With respect to negotiations dealing with a contract, however, another section of this bill would bar the union from demanding a welfare fund. In other words, the employer could dole it out as a charity if he agreed with the Republican slogan that the Republican Party has always been a friend of the worker.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote from another interesting little document entitled "A Program for a Dynamic America—a Statement of Republican Principles." This document is a report of the Republican program committee submitted to the Republican National Committee on February 16, 1940, and I quote from page 42 of that document:

> A free labor movement is important to the maintenance of representative self-government. Labor unions, like farmers' cooperatives and other agencies of organized self-help, are among the drill grounds of democracy.

Now, I am sure that we all agree that that is beautiful. It is what is known as fine writing. But to continue:

> Their processes, when they are kept democratic, give to workers who participate in them valuable training for their wider role as citizens in community, State, and Nation. Every inroad that Government makes upon a free labor movement involves a loss to democracy.

That was from page 42 of a report from the Republican program committee in February 1940. Now, here is something from a Republican-inspired work of April 10, 1947, known as House bill 3020. As I read section 9 in connection with section 12, which outlaws monopolistic strikes, Mr. Chairman, section 9 would, among other things, operate as an outright ban on industry-wide bargaining. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask my Republican colleagues if that is what the 1940 report of the Republican program committee meant by the statement that every inroad that Government makes upon a free labor movement involves a loss to democracy; or, I might ask, in the same vein, do their proposed definitions of illegal boycotts or sympathetic strikes fit the 1940 statement of the program committee?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read from another literary effort of the Republicans. This is taken from the Republican Party platform of 1944. The first sentence under the subdivision labor reads as follows:

> The Republican Party is the historical champion of free labor.

That was in 1944. Today, the Republican Party is sponsoring a bill which would limit labor's activities to those which have not been defined by the Republicans as unfair practices, a bill which would require labor unions to make annual reports of their finances but which would make no such requirement of manufacturers' associations.

Reading further in the Republican platform of 1944, Mr. Chairman, I have found this:

> We pledge an end to political trickery in the administration of labor laws and the handling of labor disputes, and equal benefits on the basis of equality to all labor in the administration of labor controls and laws, regardless of political affiliation.

Is that what the Republicans mean when in this bill they would provide for amendments to the Clayton Act of 1914, the effect of which would be to subject to antitrust prosecution any combination or conspiracy in restraint of commerce. As you know, it was the purpose of the Clayton Act of 1914 to bar application of the Sherman antitrust law to labor unions. Now this bill would take us back to 1914. Perhaps in future labor legislation the Republican Party, with all of its fine promises to labor, will try to take us back to the yellow-dog contract,

to the good old days of blacklisting—to the Dark Ages—back to the days of Republican normalcy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to offend my Republican friends, but I think that it would be pertinent here in my recital of the traditional attitude of the Republican Party toward the labor movement to ask their indulgence for a question. It is a question of their own making and so perhaps they will not mind if I put it to them. It is simply: Have you had enough? But, Mr. Chairman, I must hurry on with another point or two.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read from another piece of Republican literature. This is a document issued by the Republican National Committee and entitled "The Republican Administration—Its Tasks and Responsibilities." Although it is undated, I assume that it was issued along about 1931 because of this concluding statement in its foreword:

> There are no 10 years of American history marked by such magnificent progress, both social and economic, as has been witnessed since 1921. The same courage, the same sense of responsibility, the same solicitude for the welfare of our people, have been shown by each succeeding administration.

Then on pages 28 and 29 there are these two paragraphs under the title of "Labor":

> Aid to labor has been furnished in a great number of directions. Wages have been very generally maintained in the face of the business depression, through agreements between industrial leaders and the President; the maximum number of employees in industry have been given work on part-time basis. Through the medium of the Federal Employment Service and its cooperating offices, 1,408,131 individuals have obtained employment since January 1, 1930. Wage earners were further protected by an executive order largely curtailing the immigration of foreign workers, which in 5 months resulted in a denial of 96,883 immigration visas, and reduced nonquota visas from Canada and Mexico from 60,000 to less than 5,000. By action of the Department of Labor, about 20,000 aliens illegally within the United States have been deported. Noteworthy, too, a requirement was made that contractors for public buildings pay the prevailing local wage scale where such buildings were erected.
>
> The Federal appropriation of $1,000,000 for the rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry was continued for another 3 years.

That was the Republican labor record, according to their own statement during that 10 years of magnificent progress. If their determination to pass this bill is an indication of their labor record for the future, we apparently may expect more Republican activity with regard to the worker in the present Congress than there was in the 10-year period of Republican administration in the twenties. But, unfortunately, judging by the attitude of the Republicans thus far in the Eightieth Congress, the added interest in labor matters is not going to redound to the benefit of the American wage earner.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is making a very excellent statement. There have been a lot of rumors around about numerous secret meetings by representatives of outside groups, such as the National Association of Manufacturers and certain other representatives, down here, conferring with members of the committee in connection with the drafting of this bill. I think those rumors should either be confirmed or dissipated in the interest of the Members of Congress because, if that is so, it is the most vicious lobby I have seen in my 19 years as a Member of Congress. The gentleman is the ranking Democratic member of the committee. Has he any information about representatives of certain interests in this country being down here and helping draft this bill or imposing their personalities in connection with the drafting of this distinctively antilabor bill?

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. I think in view of the insinuation that has been made, as chairman of the committee I should be permitted to answer.

Mr. LESINSKI. I will let the gentleman answer.

Mr. HARTLEY. I say that as far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, there have been no more visits to the committee by representatives of industry and farm groups than there have been by representatives of labor groups. And, I will add that the chairman is having difficulty in getting certain leaders of the labor movement to visit with the committee and only yesterday had to serve a subpena upon Mr. Petrillo to meet with us.

Mr. LESINSKI. I will answer the gentleman from Massachusetts. The minority had no hand in shaping or writing this bill. This bill was presented to us on Thursday morning, and we met Thursday afternoon, and we also sat Friday afternoon until the reading of the bill was completed and amendments made, and we only met Saturday for the purpose of passing the bill, and we had Saturday night to file our minority report. That is all I can answer on that.

Mr. McCORMACK. There have been a lot of rumors going around, and it is only fair that they should either be repudiated or confirmed. There have been a lot of rumors around. Has the gentleman any knowledge of that?

Mr. LESINSKI. I realize that there have been rumors. I do not have any knowledge. I have not attended any meetings. We were not called in and I do not know what happened until the bill came before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Hoffman, you are going to have time on your side. The time is equally divided, and I must give time to my men. Your chairman will allot you time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wanted to ask a question.

Mr. LESINSKI. Well, you can ask that on your side.

To return to more recent times, Mr. Chairman, I want to read a bit more from the Republican platform of 1944:

> The Department of Labor has been emasculated by the New Deal. * * * All governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor.

I thoroughly agree with that statement, Mr. Chairman, and that is why I am violently opposed to title III of this bill which would take the Conciliation Service out of the Department of Labor. Of course, Mr. President, the statement which I read to the effect that all labor activities must be placed under the direct authority of the Department of Labor, was made in 1944. This is 1947 and the Republicans have had enough of their promises. They are in the saddle now and they have had enough of fair labor practices. They mean to legislate away the standards we have built up and, though I hope this Congress will come to its senses before it passes such vicious legislation, if it does pass, I predict that the labor strife of the last year will look like a Sunday school picnic in comparison with the labor strife that will be engendered by this thoughtless, discriminatory bill.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I heard aright, the last statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] was to the effect that if we passed labor legislation we would have more strikes. Some labor leaders have been threatening the Congress with a Nation-wide strike for some time. If it takes a labor bill and strikes to settle the issue as to whether the national welfare or the special privileges granted to minority groups comes first, which is the question which has been bothering the country for the last 10 years, the sooner we get the strikes, if they are inevitable and must come, and have them over with, the better; at least, that is my opinion. If a tooth must be filled or pulled, if I must be operated upon, I have always followed the practice of getting it over with instead of thinking and talking about it.

The gentleman complains about the way the bill was written. He may be correct in his statement as to when he first saw the present bill, but for the last 8 years, for 8 long years, while the gentleman's party had absolute control of every branch of the Government, many of the provisions of this legislation were pending before the labor committee, of which the gentleman was a member, and the committee buried it. I know about that. I introduced it. I was on the committee. It comes with rather bad grace for the gentleman to complain now.

As for the Republican Party, its platform, and its broken promises, I suggest the gentleman read the platform on which President Roosevelt was first elected. There was a good platform so far as promises were concerned. But if there was any promise in that platform

that the gentleman's party did not break the first year it was in power, I would like to know what it was.

Why were labor unions given special protection? Why have we labor unions today? We have labor unions because, when mass production industry came to this country with its automatic machines and its miles of assembly lines, the man who worked in a factory became automatically almost a part of the machinery. He lost his individuality. He came close to being an ox in a yoke. The corporations grew to be all-powerful, and the individual worker was unable to cope with management.

So the Congress of the United States in 1934, ever mindful of its duty, ever sympathetic to those you might term the weak, the underprivileged, the unprotected, enacted the Labor Relations Act, commonly known as the Wagner Act. The Congress made that law unequal, unfair, and lopsided. It imposed liabilities, responsibilities, and penalties upon employers. It granted special privileges to labor unions and labor leaders without imposing any responsibility, without imposing any penalties upon them. The Congress did that deliberately because the laboring man, the workers in the factories, were unable to bargain on an equal basis with industry. So we made the law, as I said, lopsided, unjust, and unfair had the parties been on equal footing, but the parties did not have equal bargaining power. It was something like the teeter board we used to play on when we were children. The little kid, the lightweight, got the long end of the board, the big kid the short end, so it would go up and down, so the teeter board would work. So we gave the workingman the big end of the deal. The short end to the employer. But times and conditions have changed and the unions are now strong and powerful—the employer—especially the one who gives a few jobs, is weak. So the teeter board—the law—must be shifted to give equal leverage to each.

Unfortunately, as so often happens when a law is unfair, the unions prospered unduly under that law. They took in millions of new members. They collected millions upon millions of dollars. Just a little while ago, two years ago, at a convention in New Jersey, the teamsters, Dan Tobin's union, boasted that it had $4,000,000 in cash, that it had $5,000,000 in bonds. It also authorized its executive board, or rather, its president, Dan Tobin, to spend any part of the $4,000,000 in cash to defeat Congressmen. It forgot the labor field and the employee and dropped over into politics. And some unions and the PAC did their dirtiest to intimidate and coerce Congress and individual Members of Congress.

As so often happens when you have millions of dollars all hung up in plain sight ready to be spent, and you have a loosely knit organization, the profiteers are waiting, in this instance the racketeers and the gangsters who had been in the prohibition game—recall?—making millions of dollars, slipped over into the unions. Was it the fault of the average union man? Oh, no. He was busy working. When his job was over in the daytime, he went home to be with his family, perhaps to work in the garden, perhaps to visit with his wife and children, perhaps to go on a little outing with them. Perhaps to study to make himself a better worker—a better citizen. He was not looking after union politics. But the gangster and the union politician and the racketeer, they were all johnny-on-the-spot. They infiltrated into the union organizations. Throughout this country extortion and racketeering under their guidance grew up until today there is not a community in the country that is not affected by the unlawful activities of those men; there is not an individual. The farmer? The farmer today cannot haul his produce to market without paying, if you want to use the polite term, a tax to the union to use as it wants to. He pays if he uses the public highway.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]—from Detroit, if I may suggest—does not get a single pound of food that does not have the teamsters' tax on it. He complains of the high cost of living and the taxes and all. Oh, the teamsters' union taxes him. The President talks about the high cost of living. He says nothing about the exorbitant sums collected by union racketeers which are reflected in the prices the worker and all others must pay.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is in the contracting business. He cannot buy a foot of lumber; he cannot buy a keg of nails; he cannot buy a single brick to carry on his business, without paying a tax to the teamsters' union and to a half dozen other unions which have a part in production of each item.

I wonder how he likes it. Why complain about the high cost of living? Why complain about the Republican Party when for 14 years his party has had absolute control, has encouraged rather than frowned upon those conditions which all now admit are outrageous?

In Detroit there are small corner grocery stores, the papa-and-mama stores, as they call them, where papa and mama are running the store and doing all the labor themselves, trying to carry on and make a livelihood and a few additional dollars so they can educate and clothe their children and perchance give them a little stake when they want to build a home of their own. Around comes Mr. Hoffa, of Detroit, head of that union which permits him to practice extortion, and he says: "Papa and mama, even though you are employers, even though you never have hired a man, you are employees even though no one hires you, no one pays you, and you must come across to Hoffa's teamsters' union." Under the law only employees can be members of a union. But the teamsters' union and other unions say to papa and mama, "Join up, pay up, or else."

You cannot do business in Detroit and a hundred cities today unless you meet the demands of some union. Talk about the need of labor legislation throughout this country? I say, those unions, not the unions that the Wagner law anticipated, but the unions that the gangsters and racketeers and extortionists have given labor—the kind of unions controlled by these men who are levying a tax upon the farmer, upon the businessman, and upon the little man who wants to run a store, they must be made to know that extortion is a crime, the United States Supreme Court to the contrary notwithstanding. All throughout the country, store after store had to pay the teamsters' union in order to get goods from the warehouses. And the clerks had to join.

And the union man? What of him? Time and again the union man has been fired from the union because he did not go along with the men who were in control of his union. There are cases in the books, decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, decisions by the courts, where the courts have had to come to the rescue of the man that this law, the National Labor Relations Act, was designed to protect, where they had to come to his rescue to protect him from the union itself when he ventured to express an opinion and some crook in union office made it hot for the real worker. I say nothing of the N. L. R. A. which denied, as did that act, the employer the right to free speech. I am talking now about the union man who was denied free speech and a job—who could not go to his job because of the closed shop situation, and in many other instances where the union boss wanted to impose his will and coerce the union members who did not agree with him. Some man in the union spoke up. Immediately he was fired and it took a decision of the United States Court of Appeals to get his job back for him. To restore to the union member his right of free speech.

Talk about this bill being an anti-labor bill? Why, this bill is a bill to protect the union man himself. It is the workingman's Bill of Rights. For the first time since labor legislation has been written, you have here a bill which in its title—in its title expresses concern for the public, for the non-union employee, for the employee who is a union man, for the union, and the only one who is condemned in this bill is the racketeer, the extortionist, the man who is hiding behind the cloak of unionism, masquerading as a union official, but who is, after all, nothing but a crook carrying on a crook's business and living upon legitimate business, oppressing the poor, oppressing those who must work, and doing it by assuming the title, the role of masquerading as a union official.

Those men were crooks—they are crooks—they always will be crooks, because their business is crooked, and if they were deacons in a church they would still be crooked. This bill is designed to get them to give to the real workers—to the union man the protection he needs—to give to the public the protection to which it is entitled.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, it is always very amusing to listen to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and I am sure that we have all, for the twenty-sixth time, enjoyed his remarks

on the same subject. However, as far as I was able to interpret the gentleman's remarks, he really did not give us much information on the bill. However, perhaps that may come later. We should probably hear from him again—often and long.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. R. 3020 and in support of the minority report. I know the members of the committee will discuss the over-all features of the bill. Therefore, I will confine my remarks to just a few parts of the bill, particularly the part which has to do with the Conciliation Service. Changing the name of the Conciliation Service—a Service that has held the respect of labor and management during its 34 years of service—seems to me just another one of the "sleight of hand" performances you have been indulging in throughout the entire consideration of this bill. My information is that changing the name of the Service will not improve the method of handling labor disputes. In fact, it will have the opposite effect because, as I have said, the people of the country have knowledge and respect for the 34-year-old Conciliation Service. It has not been perfect, but by the same token neither has Congress, nor has any other service which must depend upon human behavior but when its long record of useful service is compared with its very few mistakes, the scales tip very decidedly in favor of its useful service. We know that in the final analysis conciliation rests upon voluntary cooperation. The only thing apparently new in creating the Office of Conciliation is that it separates the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor. Is that what you want to do, and, if so, why? It seems to me a completely stupid thing to do. Everybody knows that under our system of government, the people, the Congress, and the President look to the Secretary of Labor as the cabinet officer in charge of labor relations problems to maintain industrial peace. If you divest the Secretary of Labor of the conciliation function, how can he properly exercise his duty to maintain industrial peace? It is just an impossible situation.

This is not a labor bill. It should be called an anti-Democratic bill. It is a monstrosity—the objective of which is plain. The destruction of labor unions in America.

Of course, I realize how difficult it must be for the Labor Committee to bring in a fair and reasonable bill for consideration. Unfortunately, there are few members on the committee who have had much experience in dealing with labor problems and the new members probably do not realize the great service rendered by labor during the war years, when not only our own country but our allies looked to labor to save the world by supplying the implements of war. There were differences of opinion and strikes, to be sure, but no fair-minded human being will deny that upon the backs of labor rested a very great responsibility and it came through, with flying colors supplying the Army and Navy with the implements necessary to win our glorious victory. Too many people forget the great service labor rendered, and, unfortunately, remember only the strikes, many of which were justified. They forget too that industry got "its pound of flesh" and if you do not believe this, I will just refer you to the industry reports of the past several years. Industry took no chances with their "cost plus" and the "plus" was plenty.

Just now it is the fashion to condemn labor and by this bill you are attempting to destroy labor but you cannot do it. And, I predict that if you vote for this bill, conceived in hate and hysteria, you will regret that vote and if you have any further political ambition, it will die with this Congress.

And now I shall attempt to explain title 2 of this bill as I see it.

Title II of the proposed bill would wipe out the existing Conciliation Service and create an independent agency separate and apart from the Department of Labor. All of the functions of the Secretary of Labor and the United States Conciliation Service as provided for under the Enabling Act of 1913 establishing the Department of Labor, are transferred to the new Office of Conciliation. The new Office of Conciliation would have no new or additional powers to those now being exercised by the United States Conciliation Service. As a matter of fact, it fails to make provision for some of the preventive conciliation procedures now being used by the Conciliation Service and it fails to make provision for a Labor-Management Advisory Committee, which is now providing such able assistance and guidance to the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Conciliation Service. Since the Office of Conciliation has no new provisions under H. R. 3020 there certainly is no reason for engaging in the "sleight of hand" of changing the name of the agency. We certainly will have no better agency for handling labor disputes just by changing its name. As a matter of fact, we will undoubtedly have a worse agency because the people of the country have come to respect the name and reputation of the Conciliation Service as built up in its 34 years of experience.

As we all know, conciliation rests upon voluntarism. Both labor and management must accept the facilities of the Conciliation Service if its work is to succeed. If the suggestions and proposals made by the Conciliation Service are to be given due weight and consideration, they must come from an agency which commands the respect of the parties to the dispute as well as the respect and confidence of the public. The Conciliation Service now commands that respect and confidence. A new agency, no matter how good its intention, cannot build up that respect and confidence overnight. It certainly cannot have that respect and confidence during this critical period of reconversion from a war economy to a peace economy. Lacking that confidence, it cannot have the same degree of success in settling disputes as the present Conciliation Service now has.

Before voting on this bill I think it is important that we examine what it seeks to achieve. On its face it would create a new Office of Conciliation with no new powers from those now being exercised by the Conciliation Service. The only thing new about the proposal is that it would separate the Office of Conciliation from the Department of Labor. If there were any sound reasons for the separation, I for one would support it. But let us look at the reasons submitted by the majority in support of this proposal. Page 45 of the report states:

> Sections 201 and 202 create an Office of Conciliation, an independent agency, and transfer to it functions of the United States Conciliation Service, and define the duties of the Office of Conciliation.

That is all that the majority report has to say in support of the establishment of a new independent agency, wiping out the long-established Conciliation Service. The reasoning behind this proposal is not difficult to analyze. There just is not any reasoning. If there is, it is a deep, dark secret which the majority apparently is afraid to have included in its report. The fact is that there is no good, legitimate reason for establishing an independent Conciliation Service. The fact is that we now have a strong Conciliation Service with 34 years of experience. We should not wipe out that vast store of experience by an irrational, unreasoning vote.

There is only one result to be achieved by establishing an independent Conciliation Service. That result is a duplication of functions. We all know that under our system of government, the people, the Congress, and the President look to the Secretary of Labor as the Cabinet officer in charge of labor-relations problems to maintain industrial peace. If we divest the Secretary of Labor of his conciliation function he cannot properly exercise his duty to maintain industrial peace. As President Truman stated in his veto message on the Case bill last year:

> This creates a new five-man Federal Mediation Board. All mediation and conciliation functions of the Secretary of Labor and the United States Conciliation Service are transferred to the Board. The Board, although technically within the Department of Labor, would not be under the control of the Secretary of Labor.
>
> I consider the establishment of this new agency to be inconsistent with the principles of good administration. As I have previously stated it is my opinion that Government today demands reorganization along the lines which the Congress has set forth in the Reorganization Act of 1945, i. e., the organization of Government activity into the fewest number of Government agencies consistent with efficiency. Control of purely administrative matters should be grouped as much as possible under members of the Cabinet, who are in turn responsible to the President.
>
> The proposed Federal Mediation Board will have no quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative functions. It would be purely an administrative agency. Surely functions of this kind should be concentrated in the Department of Labor.
>
> Since 1913 there has been within the Department of Labor and responsible to the Secretary of Labor a United States Conciliation Service formed with the very purpose of encouraging the settlement of labor disputes through mediation, conciliation, and other good offices. The record of that Service has been outstanding. During the period of 1 year, from May 1945 through April 1946, it settled under existing law 19,930 labor disputes. Included in this total were 3,152 strikes, almost 10 each day. The Conciliation Service has formed one of the principal divisions of the Department of Labor.

The bill proposed to transfer that Service and its functions to the newly formed Federal Mediation Board. To me this is the equivalent of creating a separate and duplicate Department of Labor, depriving the Secretary of Labor of many of his principal responsibilities, and placing the conciliation and mediation functions in an independent body.

In the eyes of Congress and of the public the President and the Secretary of Labor would remain responsible for the exercise of mediation and conciliation functions in labor disputes, while, in fact, those functions would be conducted by another body not fully responsible to either.

As far back as September 6, 1945, I said in a message to Congress: "Meanwhile, plans for strengthening the Department of Labor, and bringing under it functions belonging to it, are going forward." The establishment of the proposed Federal Mediation Board is a backward step.

Everything that the President said with respect to a Mediation Board applies with equal strength to an independent Office of Conciliation. The hearings before our committee preceding the majority report have proven that our great President exercised sound judgment when he vetoed the Case bill, for many of the people who a year ago clamored for an independent agency for the mediation of labor disputes have since changed their minds. The provision of H. R. 3020 calling for an independent agency is certainly not based upon any evidence presented at the hearings before this committee. On the contrary, if time were taken by the majority to read the hearings, they would find that representatives of organized management and labor have opposed the separation of the conciliation facilities from the Department of Labor. The roster of leading representatives of management and labor who favored the continuation of the present Conciliation Service within the Department of Labor is indeed impressive. The National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the International Association of Machinists, and the National Federation of Telephone Workers all testified before this committee that they favored the retention of the present Conciliation Service within the Department of Labor, and the Committee for Economic Development, which favored a new Conciliation Service, did recommend that it be kept within the Department of Labor for housekeeping purposes.

In November 1945 the President's National Labor-Management Conference on Industrial Relations unanimously recommended that the Conciliation Service be continued within the Department of Labor. This conference, composed of leaders of industry and labor in the United States, the real experts in the field of labor relations, the people who work with the problem on a day-to-day basis, saw no reason for establishing an independent Conciliation Service. This conference was composed of representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers, the chamber of commerce, the AFL, the CIO, the railway brotherhoods, and the United Mine Workers. Although these people did not agree on many things, they did agree upon one very important fact. They unanimously agreed that the Conciliation Service should be reorganized and strengthened and that it should remain within the Department of Labor.

As recently as December 1946, the Thirteenth National Conference on Labor Legislation of representatives of State labor commissions went on record as saying "that the Federal Government continue to discharge its responsibility for mediation and conciliation of disputes through the Conciliation Service within the United States Department of Labor." That is the recommendation of State labor commissioners who work with the problems of labor relations on the community level or at the grassroots level, if you will. They know how industrial disputes can best be handled. They felt that the Conciliation Service was doing a good job and should be left within the Department of Labor.

The recommendation for reorganization of the Conciliation Service made by the President's National Labor-Management Conference was accepted seriously by Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach and his Director of Conciliation, Edgar L. Warren. As one of the most important steps taken in that reorganization process, a Labor-Management Advisory Committee was set up to meet regularly with the Secretary of Labor and the Director of Conciliation to make recommendations on procedures to be employed by the Conciliation Service for the better performance of its job of settling disputes. This Advisory Committee is made up of people nominated by the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, the AFL, and CIO. The work of this Committee is by no means perfunctory. It meets with the Secretary and the Director on a regular monthly basis. Its recommendations are taken seriously and not a single major reorganizational step has been taken unless it was either upon the recommendation of or with the approval of the Advisory Committee. That reorganization program has proved effective and the Service is now operating smoothly. In the past year it settled more than 13,000 labor disputes. In more than 90 percent of the cases in which the Conciliation Service was called in before a strike occurred, the Service succeeded in closing those cases without a strike occurring. Gentlemen, when you bat .900 in this tough field of labor disputes you really belong in the big leagues. I do not know of any manager who, when he had a team batting .900, would decide, because of some whim, to put in his second team. He knows as well as I do that the fans would have his neck in no time and I fear that our fans, the public would have our necks if we vote to put in a second team when we now have a team that is batting over .900.

What is even worse is that under this proposal we do not even know what kind of a second team we would have, because H. R. 3020 fails to provide for a transfer of the present Conciliation Service personnel to the new agency. Thus in one fell stroke we would wipe out the entire experience built up over 34 years of the present Conciliation Service. That section of the bill which fails to transfer the present personnel to the new agency is so drastic and irresponsible in its nature that I would like to discuss that in greater detail later in my speech. At this time I want to continue for a few minutes on the steps taken by the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Conciliation Service for strengthening the Conciliation Service pursuant to the unanimous recommendation of the President's Labor-Management Conference. I will not discuss those steps in detail as many of you already know them and representatives of labor and management know them and are pleased with them and the public generally has received them with acclaim. Some of the steps taken pursuant to the recommendation of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee are:

First. Establishment of a Labor-Management Advisory Committee from nominees recommended by the AFL, CIO, NAM, and chamber of commerce.

Second. Establishment of regional advisory committees on the same basis.

Third. Decentralization of the field organization.

Fourth. Reorganization of the Arbitration Division.

Fifth. Reorganization of the Technical Division.

Sixth. Establishment of a Program Division for training of new officers and keeping the staff up to date on current labor-relations problems and developing improved mediation techniques.

Seventh. Appointment of special conciliators to supplement the activities of regular conciliators in key disputes.

Eighth. Commencement of a program through the Philadelphia Assembly and Utility Conference for cooperation with local groups for settlement of labor disputes on the local and industry levels.

Ninth. Establishment of procedures for tripartite mediation.

Tenth. Fact finding.

I believe, as do my colleagues in the minority, that the record of the Conciliation Service has been a remarkable one. If you remember that this record was made during the most difficult period in our history, during a period when we reconverted our vast war machine to a peacetime machine, that record is the more remarkable. It would seem the sheerest kind of folly for us to cast aside this experienced, well-trained organization and replace it with an inexperienced, untried agency. Our reconversion process is not complete. We still have a long way to go. Prices are still on the uprise. Until prices are brought down, we will have considerable industrial unrest. We cannot afford to have green men handling the industrial problems that we will face during the next year.

The majority gives exactly the same reason for failing to transfer the personnel of the present Conciliation Service to the new agency as it does for setting up the new independent agency. No reason whatsoever. This failure to use the vast store of experience built up by the Conciliation Service since its establishment in 1913 is the height of recklessness and irresponsibility. As the minority report points out, of the top 31 members of the staff in the highest grades of the Service, there is a total

of 362 years of service in the Federal Government, 269 of which were in the Department of Labor. When the public is demanding that we provide for a strong Conciliation Service, the majority recklessly proposes that we wipe out this vast reservoir of experience.

If the majority believes that there is an overabundance of trained conciliators available, they are sadly mistaken. If they believe that they can find 400 Republicans who are trained conciliators, they are sadly mistaken. I have no doubt but that they can find 400 Republicans who want jobs, but I do know that they cannot find 400 men with the background and experience necessary to settle the difficult problems involved in current labor disputes, and I do know that the conciliators now on the staff of the Service who have come from all walks of life have a background of industrial-relations experience that cannot be duplicated by inexperienced, untried men. I know as do a good many of my colleagues in this House that a strong Conciliation Service as demanded by the people cannot be created just by passing a law here, but that it can be built only upon a foundation of experienced and highly qualified personnel.

This proposal of the majority to wipe out the present Conciliation Service is not only a form of reckless folly, but is an example of the worst kind of partisanship. This proposal of the majority is not founded upon one iota of testimony before the committee. Aside from this proposal which the majority submitted to us at the last minute on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, there has not been a single bill introduced into this House or the Senate relating to methods for conciliating disputes which does not contain a provision for the transfer of the present Conciliation Service personnel to the proposed new agency. Every single bill introduced into either House of this Congress recognized that a proposed new agency would have absolutely no chance of success unless it were to be built upon the foundation of the experienced personnel of the present Conciliation Service. The majority proposal under H. R. 3020 is not based upon any of the bills considered during the hearings. It is not based upon any of the testimony presented at the hearings. It is a proposal that the majority just pulled out of a hat for pure partisan reasons. It is about time that the Republicans in their newly won power began to realize that the people of this country do not like partisan trickery. The people of this country want industrial peace. They want economic prosperity. The people want an impartial Conciliation Service. They demand a nonpartisan Conciliation Service. They now have that kind of a Service.

The Republican majority apparently wants to create a Republican Conciliation Service. Labor disputes cannot be settled by a Republican Conciliation Service or a Democratic Conciliation Service. They can be settled only by a nonpartisan impartial Conciliation Service. That is the kind of Service they now have. It should not be tampered with.

When I say that the Conciliation Service should not be tampered with, I know that I speak for my distinguished colleagues of the minority. When I say that we favor constructive proposals to strengthen and extend the facilities of the Conciliation Service, we of the minority believe that there are some constructive steps that can still be taken to extend those facilities. President Truman in his state of the Union message pointed the way to the kind of extended facilities that were required when he said:

Point No. 2 is the extension of the facilities within the Department of Labor for assisting collective bargaining. One of our difficulties in avoiding labor strife arises from a lack of order in the collective bargaining process. The parties often do not have a clear understanding of their responsibility for settling disputes through their own negotiations. We constantly see instances where labor or management resorts to economic force without exhausting the possibilities for agreement through the bargaining process. Neither the parties nor the Government have a definite yardstick for determining when and how Government assistance should be invoked. There is need for integrated governmental machinery to provide the successive steps of mediation, voluntary arbitration, and—ultimately in appropriate cases—ascertainment of the facts of the dispute and the reporting of them to the public. Such machinery would facilitate and expedite the settlement of disputes.

We of the minority support this program of our great President and we have indicated that we would support a bill containing the constructive proposals set forth in the State of the Union message. The majority, however, were in too great a hurry to pass a law to even meet with the minority for the purpose of considering the views of the minority. Instead they just presented us with a bill and, in effect, said "take it or leave it." In their newly won power the Republicans seem to have forgotten that we have a two-party system and that the people of this country expect those two parties to work jointly in framing legislation for the good of all the people. The people of this country do not like "take it or leave it" offers from anybody and they will not like it when such offers are made by the Republican majority. We still believe that there are constructive steps that can and should be taken, and they are the steps set forth in the President's State of the Union message.

Before voting on this proposal to divorce the present Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor and to set up a new Conciliation Service independent of that Department, I believe the Members of this body should consider for a few minutes a brief history of the Department of Labor and the Republican platform of 1944 as it relates to the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor was created by the Enabling Act of 1913. It was adopted by a Republican Congress. It was signed by President Taft, the father of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as his last official act. I believe the Republican Party and President Taft deserve great credit for giving birth to the Department of Labor. But this certainly does not give them the right to tear it down and destroy it.

The Republican platform for 1944 states:

The Department of Labor has been emasculated by the New Deal. Labor bureaus, agencies, and committees are scattered far and wide, in Washington and throughout the country, and have no semblance of systematic or responsible organization. All governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor. (Report, Factual Campaign Information issued by Senate Library, September 30, 1946.)

This proposal to set up an independent agency is clearly inconsistent with the Republican platform proposal that "all governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor." If the Republican majority thinks it can get away with talking out of one side of its mouth during election campaigns and out of the other side of its mouth in this Congress, they are wrong. The people of this country are watching them and they expect them to fulfill their campaign pledges. A vote for this bill is a vote against the 1944 Republican platform.

I would like to comment very briefly on sections 203 and 204 of the proposed bill relating to strikes imperiling public health and safety. I will not dwell upon it at any great length as I understand that others of my distinguished colleagues will discuss it in greater detail. As the minority report states, sections 203 and 204 create a hodgepodge machinery for handling public utilities disputes. It creates a procedure for compulsory arbitration without establishing any standards under which the decisions are to be made. All it calls for is an opinion as to how the case should be settled, without requiring any statement of the facts upon which the opinion is based. Depending upon the whim of the special Board set up under the act, the entire resources of the public utilities companies can be given away to the employees or all the rights of the employees can be taken away from them depending upon how overdeveloped or underdeveloped a sense of equity that Board may have. It places in the hands of inexperienced people the disposition of the cases most directly affecting the national welfare.

The handling of these important public utilities disputes is typical of Republican "pass-the-buck" procedure. Such cases would be handled by the President, the Attorney General, the district courts, the Office of Conciliation, the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act, the circuit court of appeals, and special boards appointed by the chief justice of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Everybody seems to get "into the act" except Jimmy Durante. As the minority report points out, it will be impossible to fix responsibility for mishandling of one of these critical labor disputes. Which one of the numerous people handling it at each step of the way is responsible will be the real $64 question. If the Republicans prefer that the responsibility not be fixed, if

they prefer this irresponsible hodgepodge approach, if they prefer this state of confusion they will quickly find that the public will not let them get away with it. The public will not be confused. It will place the responsibility right back where it belongs, on those Members of Congress who vote to adopt this "pass-the-buck" procedure.

If we were to sum up in one sentence the effect of title II of H. R. 3020, I think we could say that it wipes out in one fell swoop the vast store of experience built up by the Conciliation Service in the 34 years since it was created in 1913. This bill proposes to get labor disputes settled merely by changing the name of the agency doing the job and by bringing in inexperienced, untried people to handle problems requiring years of practical experience. This bill would create dual responsibility for handling industrial labor relations problems between the new Office of Conciliation and the Secretary of Labor. It would create a new unnecessary agency at a time when the public is seeking sound economy and consolidation of agencies dealing with related problems.

As the second part of the title, the bill creates a complicated "super-duper" machinery designed to handle public utilities cases. It provides the kind of machinery which was condemned by the Labor-Management Advisory Committee, when it said on December 16, 1946:

Members of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee believe that a system of free collective bargaining can work. We believe that any form of compulsory arbitration or super machinery for disposition of labor disputes may frustrate rather than foster industrial peace. With collective bargaining freed from all wartime controls, we believe that American industry and American labor can and will assume their individual and joint responsibilities for the production of the goods and services so necessary to a prosperous peacetime America.

This new machinery instead of curtailing Government interference would provide for Government interference by numerous branches of the Government. If the Republican Party thinks they were given a mandate to pass antilabor laws they are wrong. They did receive a mandate for less governmental interference in our domestic affairs. This bill instead of giving us less Government interference would provide for more Government interference than we have ever had before in our history. This bill will give us Government interference by untried, inexperienced hands. This bill would deprive the Government and the people of the vast store of experience built up in the Conciliation Service, which is well prepared and ably equipped to handle labor disputes. A vote for this bill is a vote for more strikes. A vote for this bill is a vote for industrial chaos. I urge that this bill be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from New Jersey one additional minute.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. As many of us know, the gentlewoman from New Jersey served with distinction as chairman of the Committee on Labor of the House for many years. I have often wondered if she cared to explain to me and the other Members of the House why she resigned from the Committee on Labor this year and this session?

Mrs. NORTON. Frankly, in one sense, I regret that the gentleman has asked me the question because I have never knowingly hurt a Member of Congress on either side of the aisle. I have a very great respect and affection for the Members I have served with, but I regret to say I have no respect for the present chairman of the Labor Committee. And I could not serve with a chairman for whom I hold no respect. My reason for that is that during the 10 years I was chairman of the Labor Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, who is now the chairman of the Labor Committee, and who comes here before you and talks about labor as if he knew something about it, attended exactly six meetings in 10 years. That was my reason for leaving the Committee on Labor.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to use my own words in response to the remarks just made, that I think more properly might have been withheld, but I am going to read a letter addressed to me as late as April 1940, after I had been a Member of this House for 12 years:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 26, 1940.*

To All City Central Bodies and Local Labor Unions in the Tenth Congressional District of New Jersey:

I am sending this letter in behalf of Congressman FRED A. HARTLEY, who, by his votes and general attitude, has proven himself to be an outstanding friend of labor.

He is one of the high ranking members of the Labor Committee of the United States House of Representatives and he is ever alert in that committee and elsewhere in the interest of labor.

Every one of the votes he cast while a Member of Congress has supported the views of the American Federation of Labor. I urge that the membership of every local union be advised of this fine attitude of Congressman HARTLEY and that they in turn request the members of their family, their neighbors, and their friends in his district to support him in the coming primary and the November election.

Let us prove to all that we are truly grateful to Congressman HARTLEY for the fine service he has rendered us by returning him to Congress by an overwhelming vote.

Fraternally yours.

And it is signed: "William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, since it is appropriate to read from the Republican Party platform of 1944, I want to quote the last paragraph of that platform:

American well-being is indivisible. Any national program which injures the national economy inevitably injures the wage-earner. The American labor movement and the Republican Party, while continuously striving for the betterment of labor's status, rejects the communistic and the New Deal concept that a single group can benefit while the general economy suffers.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot expect to solve all labor-management problems by legislation but we can stop the Red labor leaders and stop labor racketeering. Our main objective should be to enact a labor law which would encourage settlement of disputes between labor and management and minimize strikes and lockouts.

We must protect the public from union leaders who have misused their power. We must give labor the right to strike and give the rank and file of labor the right to take a greater part in their problems.

No one should condone jurisdictional disputes, wildcat strikes, secondary boycotts, mass picketing, and violence and destruction of property.

Secondary boycotts have cost the Nation a loss of millions of dollars in foodstuffs. A lettuce strike in California caused a loss of 2,000 cars of lettuce. Twenty thousand gallons of hot milk were dumped one morning in front of the city hall of Los Angeles. One million dollars were lost in an asparagus strike. Farmers in California were forced to dump 76 carloads of lemons because they could not get them unloaded and delivered to the markets. By reason of the labor leaders high-handed methods, used on Dock Street, Philadelphia, $125,000 worth of perishable fruits and vegetables have rotted because dealers were prevented from either moving or selling them since January 6 of this year. A returning veteran who went into business for himself testified that he was not permitted to use his own truck even though he employed a union driver. These union leaders on Dock Street gave one of the merchants 15 minutes to get off the street. This merchant had worked on this street for 57 years. The union demands that an employer may be permitted on the firm's premises on Saturday morning provided permission to do so is obtained from the union in advance. The union also demands that where a partnership of two persons exists, but who employ no salesmen, one member of that partnership must be a member of this union. Therefore, in the event of a strike one partner would be forced to picket the other.

This industrial unrest proves that our present labor laws are thoroughly inadequate of attaining industrial peace. And we intend to do something about it in terms of what is best for all of the people.

But in finding the solution for labor abuses we should not abolish labor unions. The right to strike, industry-wide bargaining, the union shop and the check-off are union fundamentals.

If you outlaw industry-wide bargaining you will create industrial strife in such industries as steel, automobile, clothing, longshoremen, coal, rubber, and newspaper unions. If the employers and employees want to bargain on an industry-wide or area basis, I see no objection. You are not going to stop strikes but you

will create thousands of strikes. I have not heard a sound argument yet to abolish industry-wide bargaining. If you outlaw industry-wide bargaining strong unions will have an excellent chance of picking the smaller employers one by one. As a result of the abolition of industry-wide bargaining we will return to cut-throat competition, scab coal mines and sweatshops. We certainly do not want the Government to take over all of the functions of labor and management.

If we have to regulate and regiment the employees and employers we might as well repeal the National Labor Relations Act and save the taxpayers the money of administering it. The workers and management would have more freedom without these regulations.

I would also like to discuss briefly three other proposals in this bill. The first is the definition of "employee." There is some doubt as to whether an employee has a right to strike for legitimate reasons under the present definition.

The second is the welfare funds under section 8 (a) (2) (C). This section of the bill would invalidate thousands of our existing health-benefit agreements. These welfare funds should be left to collective bargaining. I see no reason why we should even try to protect the employer on this subject because the employer certainly has a right to reject such a proposal.

The third point is the automatic check-off. Especially where a union shop exists, the employer should have the right of deciding whether or not he wants to give the automatic check-off. The automatic check-off in many cases is very convenient to the employer. I have talked to hundreds of businessmen in the past year and not a single one has asked me to outlaw the check-off. It should be left to collective bargaining.

As a member of the House Labor Committee for 9 years I did not have the opportunity to present industry-wide bargaining and the welfare fund to the full committee. I hope to present these amendments to the House Thursday.

I would like to read two typical letters which will demonstrate what the rank and file think. One comes from Osage, W. Va., and it reads:

HONORABLE SIR: I am a coal miner of West Virginia and speak for myself and information I gather from other miners.

There is a very, very few men want to strike and 90 percent of the miners in this district are in favor of some kind of legislation that will give them a voice about if they want to strike or not. They also think that there should be a law compelling union organizations to pay every man a certain amount for each day he is out on strike, say about one-fourth his daily wages earned in the mines, and no increase in union dues to be imposed. A cut to one-half of all union officials' salaries during the time of strike. Such a law would stop this strike business. The wage earner at present pays the bill for a strike. Let the union officials help pay the bill and also pay the striker enough to partly keep him out of debt and half enough to eat. We do not want to lose our union, but we do feel we should have a voice in it if we want to accept an offer made or not. The most of us know that the longer a strike lasts, the more certain officials get out of the union treasury, say our scale committee—they get approximately $30 a day when negotiating a contract. Sure, I, too, would try to prolong a strike as much or long as safe to do so.

There is not anything we can do about the question locally, so why not you and your fellow Representatives and Congressmen get busy; put us little fellows where we can have a say in a way that it will count, and not be compelled to listen to a few dictators.

Sincerely yours,

_____.

P. S.—A secret vote would show you at least 90 percent of the men are in favor of a no-strike law.

This letter from the rank and file which is typical. I have one more:

I want to commend your opposition to restrictions on the closed-shop contracts and industry-wide bargaining.

I see no reason why men enjoying the benefits now by a union should not be required to become members of the same. The same principle requires me to pay a school tax when I do not have children.

Industry-wide bargaining has benefitted the whole country by placing the manufacturers on an equal basis where the greed of a few will not be a detriment to those being fair with their employees. Although too often the smaller competitor is dominated by the larger corporations, the advantages to the country greatly outweigh the disadvantages that sometimes occur.

My point is this: We have taken care of practically every labor abuse I can think of, but outlawing industry-wide bargaining will not stop strikes, it will not cure any abuses. It will cause more chaos; it will tear up the whole steel industry, the automobile industry, the rubber industry, the clothing industry, the longshoremen, and the amalgamated clothing workers. When you have destroyed that system of collective bargaining, then you have hit the fundamentals of labor. I think industry-wide bargaining should be put back in the bill.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I believe the gentleman has made some mighty fine statements, but does he not believe that under our bill, in connection with the Steel Trust, for instance, the unions could bargain with the entire group at any time? Is there any question about that?

Mr. LANDIS. There is some question. The point is that the antitrust laws take care of the corporations through prices, but they do not take care of the corporations through wages. The employees should have the same benefits under the act as the employers in regard to wages.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Labor Committee for many years. I have associated with many Members of the House as they have come and gone. I have served under many chairmen. Without picking any argument with anyone, and without even implying that the chairman needs any word of defense, I simply pay this tribute to him as being something to which he is justly entitled. The chairman of this committee has worked hard. He has performed his duty as chairman. He has presided over the deliberations of the committee with fairness, justice, and dignity. At all times was he careful to preserve the rights of any minority member or any majority member, whether he thought the issue being discussed was important or not. I have not only great respect for him, but have a high regard for his friendship.

I feel that the committee has given very careful consideration to this bill. It is one of the most difficult pieces of legislation I have ever had the experience of trying to take part in writing. It is easy for any of us to say, "Well, something should be done." All of us know that. There is not a person within the sound of my voice but that knows something should be done. We certainly cannot long continue in the direction in which we are now traveling and preserve our American economy and our American way of life.

Some are going to try to say here, I expect, since that implication has been made, that all the Democrats are opposed to this bill. I say to you now that I am operating under no mandate from the Democratic Party that is inconsistent with the principles involved in this bill. And I do not propose to recognize any synthetic mandate from anyone else. If any party on earth has ever stood for a democratic form of government, a democratic way of settling differences, and a democratic way of presiding over organizations, it has been the Democratic Party, and I refuse to stand here and let some disgruntled Democrat heap all the credit on the Republicans, and I also refuse to stand here and let the Republicans claim the credit.

There is some much-needed legislation in this bill. We conducted long and tedious hearings. We called the labor leaders in before the committee, and they were given ample time to present their views. I regret to state that very few of them took an attitude of trying to help the committee, even though they themselves knew full well the dangers that were surrounding not only our economy but our American way of life, as well as our national safety itself.

I was astounded when Mr. Bittner, Van Bittner, I believe it is, appeared representing Mr. Murray, of the CIO, when he finally came out with the statement that he thought it would be a good thing for the Congress of the United States to go to sleep for 10 years and not meet. A rather ambitious person, I would say. Does he want to run the affairs of this country? Upon what meat does such a little Caesar feed?

The committee felt that even though it was an unpleasant duty it must go ahead and do something about these sympathy strikes and jurisdictional strikes, murder, and highjacking. If you will read the reports of the hearings on this bill, it will make your blood run cold to think of the things that have been carried on throughout the country. Then to take the attitude that because somebody claims to be a union member, we should refrain from taking any steps whatever. I love my church. I support my church. I wish I could do more for

it, but I do not want my church to get as far afield from its proper sphere of activity as the labor unions have gone from theirs. They have reached a point where, in many instances, they have sought to control and dictate to each individual member what he should write to his Congressman. That sounds strange, but here is a letter—here is the order that goes out to the members of a local, and it says:

In order that this program be a success, each one of you must—

In capital letters—

write letters to your representatives in the House and Senate immediately.

Skipping a paragraph or two, it says:

It is recommended that you give your letters to your steward or bring them to the union office and have your name checked off our list as one who has complied. We will gladly pay postage and mail these letters directly from the union office.

Then the next paragraph reads:

It is also recommended that those members who do not follow through with the above program be called in before the executive board of the local union No. 90 to explain why they did not comply with the above recommendations.

You will save time by writing a short letter that takes only a few minutes, rather than make an appearance before the executive board to explain why you did not do so.

And you tell me that the average union member should not be protected from that? And you tell me that this bill is not loaded down with protective clauses and paragraphs for the everyday, average workingman who is seeking a little freedom? I do not know if you can complain so much of the heads of many of these unions. They are like the average man. The average man is unworthy of too much unrestricted power. And they have enjoyed it until they have now reached the point that they regard it as an inherent right. So they have been pushing the members around. I fear they forget the fact that this Congress, in response to what it regarded as a very necessary thing to do, threw safeguards around labor and labor unions because the power of the dollar had gotten to be too great, and it was taking advantage of the laboring man who produced. So the Congress in its wisdom attempted to set the scales aright, and now it has reached the point that the scales are tipped in another direction. The American people will not live under such tipped scales in favor of anybody very long. That is why the overwhelming majority of this House is in favor of remedying the situation and that is why this bill came out of the committee with an overwhelming majority.

I will never let my partisanship for any party step in front of me when I see such dangers as are at present hovering around the national security of this Nation without raising my voice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; I yield briefly.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There was some intimation that improper influences were brought to bear on members of the committee in the writing of this bill. Does the gentleman care to comment about that?

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman. Oh, I do not know anything about that kind of business. I am not scared of anybody talking me out of my head. Why should I refuse to talk to labor organizers? I had two of them in my office this morning. Fine gentlemen. I enjoyed talking with them. If somebody from Hoshkosh who ran a store wanted to come in and talk to me, I think I would be a mental coward if I were afraid to discuss it with them. I am not suspicious enough because I see a man talking to somebody else to say "something is rotten in Denmark." I think that is placing the level of intelligence at a very poor level in this House. I do not ascribe any such thing to the Members of this House or the committee. I think the members of this committee are honest and conscientious men. They did the best job they could. Those who disagree with me, I respect them. I respect their views and I expect them to respect my conscientious convictions in the same way. That is how America has grown great. That is why the freedom of this Nation is such a priceless gem that we are not willing to give it up without a fight.

In the handling of our legislative matters we have let our production become involved. We have let it reach such a low point that it has slowed down and we know it has slowed down, yet we cry about the cost of living. We will never get the cost of living down until production is going full force. Every time you add one of these tributes that are forced from men, whether it be from the closed shop or not, every time you add one of those fees, up goes the cost of living, and the very people who are being ground into the dust by the increased cost of living are those who are crying for these safeguards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. I want to say a word about the so-called closed-shop issue in this bill—and that is about the only issue in this bill that could be classified as a major one and a major point of difference in the committee. The difference, may I say in passing, is not confined to either side, Democrat or Republican. I think an amendment will be presented on the floor, and, personally, I hope there will be a tendency to discourage the adding of a whole lot of amendments because the bill deals with a very delicate situation. It touches almost every angle of American economy, industry, and some branches of society. So when that issue comes up I am sure it will be generally debated.

Personally, I am a little inclined to go along with that great liberal, Justice Brandeis. Justice Brandeis was a very wise man and was looking far ahead when he was writing his statement on the closed shop. I believe everybody will recognize and admit that Justice Brandeis was what is termed a "truly great conscientious liberal."

Here is what Justice Brandeis said on the subject of the closed shop:

It is an essential condition of the advance of trade-unionism that the unions shall renounce violence, restriction of output, and the closed shop. * * * The American people should not, and will not, accept unionism if it involves the closed shop. They will not consent to the exchange of the tyranny of the employer for the tyranny of the employee.

I think there is no other man or body of men whose intelligence or whose character will stand in absolute power, and I should no more think of giving absolute power to unions than I should of giving to capital monopoly power.

And again he wrote:

The closed shop seems to me opposed to our ideas of liberty, as presenting a monopoly of labor which might become as objectionable a monopoly as that of capital. (The Brandeis Guide to the Modern World, pp. 139 and 140.)

Mr. Chairman, that is the very issue that will come up in this bill. There are many people who are conscientiously in favor and who are conscientiously opposed. This House is well on the way to writing some much-needed corrective legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 3020 will not provide the solution necessary to an equitable settlement of present industrial-labor differences with justice and fairness. I yield to no one in my desire for amity between employers and employees. I have always deplored strikes, for the time and money lost through strikes can never be regained. Deplorable as they are, the right to strike is recognized by all democratic governments. There are no strikes in Stalin's Russia. There were no strikes in Germany under Hitler, nor in Italy under Mussolini. The right to strike is inalienable under democracy.

Mr. Chairman, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are 58,000,000 workers in this country. With the exception of a few, they are God-fearing, law-abiding, and home-loving Americans. This bill will have the effect of an indictment of these workers.

During the Revolutionary War, when the American Colonies were fighting for their independence, British imperialists and tories were demanding the extermination of what they termed the "rebels." Edmund Burke, a great statesman and orator of that day, made a speech in the British Parliament urging conciliation, in which he said:

I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people. I cannot insult and ridicule the feelings of millions of my fellow creatures.

Burke made that statement concerning less than 4,000,000 people in the American Colonies; how much more true are his words when you multiply this number to 58,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of the Smith-Connally antilabor bill, which was passed over the veto of President Roosevelt, William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, a patriotic, conservative labor leader, appeared before committees of the Congress and warned that the Smith-Connally antilabor bill would foment labor troubles and cause untold strikes. He was supported by other labor leaders. The history of that uncalled-for legislation has proven that they were absolutely right. Mr. Green now expresses a similar fear concerning H. R. 3020. He was right before and he is undoubtedly right now.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I include as a part of my remarks a statement by the American Federation of Labor with reference to H. R. 3020. This statement is complete and comprehensive.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

The statement of policy is explicit in authorizing Federal Government's intervention into the process of collective bargaining. The Government for the first time in our history is to be given authority, not only to intervene when free and voluntary collective bargaining fails, but also to inject itself into procedures precedent to negotiations and to regulate the conduct of employees in their relation to each other and in their relationship with management. One of the stated purposes is to give the employees themselves a direct voice in the bargaining arrangements with their employers. Thus the Government would assert a policy of opposition to the very process whereby democratically chosen representatives of employees are authorized by such employees to negotiate and contract on their behalf. In other words, the purpose of the bill is to undermine and disrupt the process of collective bargaining itself. In this the bill reaches at the very foundations of voluntary representation which is a part and parcel of the free-enterprise system.

TITLE I—AMENDMENT OF NLRA

REGULATION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Section 2 provides for detailed regulation of the steps taken in the collective-bargaining process. This includes a legal requirement of five separate conferences between the employer and his employees or their representatives, within a 30-day period following the initial conference. Apart from the absurdity of prescribing by law how the parties should arrange the course of their negotiation and what consecutive steps they should take, it is untenable that what the bill purports to be collective bargaining would extend to a procedure which is not collective bargaining at all. As described in the bill, the procedure is not confined to duly chosen representatives of the employees, but may extend to the dealings between the employer and the employees themselves.

STRIKE VOTE

The workers are not expected to notify the employer or the employer to notify the workers about the impending strike or lockout. Instead the notice is to be sent to the Administrator of the NLRA. It is significant that if a threatened strike is involved, the Administrator must promptly notify the employer. Notice of a lock-out by the employer, however, is not to be conveyed to the employees. The statement of the employer's position in the dispute must be sent by registered mail to the representative. Since the representative is defined to include any individual, this means a requirement for an employer to mail his views by registered mail to every employee. A Government supervised vote is then to be taken in each disputed case. A requirement is also included for the consent by the employer regarding the procedure to be followed in the conduct of the strike vote. The employer is thus directly injected in the procedure whereby the employees make their decision. The ballot itself is prescribed by law. It mentions only the employer's last offer and makes no reference to the position taken by the union. The employees are thus precluded from the free exercise of the right which Congress cannot constitutionally deny them to freely pass upon the policies and decisions made by their own chosen representatives.

NEGOTIATIONS DRASTICALLY LIMITED

The bill specifically limits the collective bargaining procedure to stated items to be negotiated. Thousands of agreements which today provide for direct contribution by the workers through their union to greater efficiency, improved production and other forms of labor-management cooperation will no longer be an authorized subject for negotiations. A multitude of other existing agreements would have agreed provisions essential to the maintenance of industrial peace expunged as the result of this provision.

SUPERVISORS

This term is defined in order to exclude from collective bargaining employees classed as supervisors. The definition is so broad as to exclude a major proportion of wage earners from the collective bargaining process. For example, almost any employee in an establishment may be said to be given by the employer information that is confidential and is not available to the public, the competitors or the employees generally. Yet any employee who gains access to such information is termed as a "supervisor."

FEATHERBEDDING

The adoption of the proposed language would make it legally impossible for labor to reach an agreement with an employer requiring proper manning of the job necessary to meet minimum requirements of safety and health of the employees. This section is so loosely and viciously drawn as to extend far beyond the relationship between labor and management and would, if strictly applied, make the payment of any taxes imposed by Congress a featherbedding practice.

MULTIPLICITY OF AGENCIES

The bill creates a Labor-Management Relations Board and an Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act. The Administrator is given the duty to prosecute complaints of unfair labor practices before the Board. At the same time, the Administrator is also given the quasijudicial function of investigating representation petitions. He is also to act as the agent of the Board, before which he appears as a prosecutor, in making application to the courts for enforcement of orders of the Board. This new structure is, by its terms, bound to lead to confusion so vast that no employer and no union would be able to proceed with the normal conduct of employer-employee relations without a constant danger of being in violation of some requirement of the law.

RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES

Section 7 (b) gives each member of a labor organization the right to be free from unreasonable or discriminatory financial demands of such labor organizations. It also requires to have the affairs of the organization conducted in a manner that is fair to its members. None of these terms is defined and no one is given the responsibility to interpret their meaning. What is unreasonable or discriminatory? What constitutes fair manner of conduct? The bill is silent on these questions and gives no indication by whom or in what manner they should be answered.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES OF EMPLOYERS

The bill dilutes the present requirements of the NLRA and in addition outlaws the check-off of dues. Today over 5,500,000 workers, or more than 40 percent of all employees under agreement, are covered by check-off provisions voluntarily agreed to by employers. No one before either the Senate or the House has criticized the operation of the existing check-off agreements.

WELFARE FUNDS

The bill outlaws employer contributions to any health, welfare, or benefit fund, whether or not such a fund is administered by the union alone or "in conjunction with any other person." Even if a union has an indirect control in such a fund and the employer is a party to it, no employer contributions toward such a fund can legally be made.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES OF LABOR

The bill includes the provisions making it unlawful for unions to seek to compel anyone to become or remain a member of a labor organization. This provision, for many years sought by the NAM, is aimed directly against union organization. The bill would regulate initiation fees or dues and prohibit any payment of a tax required as a condition of employment. If narrowly applied, the provision of section 8 (c) (2) would make the collection of any union dues unlawful. Furthermore, the bill would grant the right to any member to resign from the organization at any time making the maintenance of a stable union membership an undesirable objective, if not an impossibility.

BENEFIT PLANS

The bill prohibits the maintenance by the union of a compulsory insurance or benefit plan. Yet there is nothing in the bill to prevent the employer from imposing compulsory group insurance or other benefit plan upon his employees.

EXPULSION OR SUSPENSION OF MEMBERS

Detailed specifications are given forbidding unions to expel or suspend any member on other than the specified ground. A union is permitted to expel a member upon conviction of a felony. Legally it could neither suspend nor expel any member upon conviction of grand larceny, treason, or other unlawful acts other than felonious act.

UNION SECURITY

The bill outlaws the union shop in four ways. One is section 8 (c) (7) which requires the acceptance to membership of any one, regardless of qualifications. Another is a provision in section 8 (d) (4) which requires a period of not less than 30 days, but otherwise unlimited, during which the employee is free not to join the labor organization. In addition section 9 of the bill eliminates the present requirement of section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act specifically authorizing the union shop. Finally, section 9 (g) prohibits a union shop agreement reached as a result of a strike or a threat of a strike. This section also requires that any agreement providing for a union shop must be followed by an application to the administrator for a secret vote of employees and also for a hearing by the administrator. The validity of a union shop agreement is limited to 2 years, after which time the complex machinery, including the Government supervised ballot, must be invoked again.

CERTIFICATION OF REPRESENTATIVES

Section 9 of the proposed bill drastically modifies the established procedure for the settlement of cases concerning representation. The changes that have been made are not supported by evidence presented to the congressional committees in the course of their hearings on proposed labor legislation.

Instead of having an investigation made whenever a question concerning representation arises, as provided in the Wagner Act, the investigation is to be made only on written application by a labor representative representing at least 30 percent of the employees in the unit. In contrast to this, an employer may ask for an investigation and an election by merely alleging that any individual has presented to him a claim that he represents a majority of the employees. It is clear that no matter what the purpose of the provisions of this section of the bill, it attempts to settle by detailed legislation problems which can only be properly resolved as they arise in each case by the National Labor Relations Board itself.

INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

Section 9 (f) makes ineligible for an election employees of two or more competing employers unless the union represents less than 100 employees of each employer or unless the employers' plants are less than 50 miles apart. In industry after industry, these provisions will serve to eliminate trade associations as collective bargaining agents for employers in a related field, thus wiping out orderly collective bargaining built up over a period of years in large areas of peaceful labor-management relations. By stating a complex stand of eligibility for certification, the bill throws wide open the door to a mass of litigation and administrative decision as to what constitutes the proper basis for certification. By the time all the questions are answered as to who competes and who doesn't; how many employees are regularly employed; and how far apart is one plant from another, the time for orderly designation of representatives will have long since passed and the industrial unrest become widespread.

THE ELECTION BALLOT

Under the present procedure of the National Labor Relations Board, the form of the ballot is determined as the result of an investigation of the Board, which decides whether any claim for representation is substantial or valid. The bill requires that space be provided on the ballot for any choice of representative whether or not such a representative has anything to do with the existing labor-management relations. It will not be surprising if this procedure results in write-in votes designating a popular movie star as the representative or some person unable or unfit to perform the function of effective labor representation.

THE USE OF THE INJUNCTION

After the complex and extended administrative procedures of the Board proposed by the bill have been carried out the complaints of unfair labor practices are made subject to court enforcement. However, the decisions of the Board are limited in a number of ways, including the provision which would give a company union the same status as a bona fide labor organization independent of employer influence or domination. The bill makes discrimination against employees for union activity extremely difficult to prevent by forbidding the Board from ordering the reinstatement of any individual as an employee "unless the weight of the evidence shows that such individual was not suspended or discharged for cause." In all court enforcement the use of the injunction is made applicable in labor disputes by amending the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Thus the amended Wagner Act is turned into a happy hunting ground for union-breaking employer relying on unbridled rule of labor by the injunction.

UNLAWFUL CONCERTED ACTIVITIES

In addition to the provision of unfair labor practices in which employees and labor organizations are prohibited to engage, section 12 contains an additional list of unlawful activities directed against unions. Section 12 thus makes the amended Wagner Act heavily balanced against labor in favor of the employer. Even more dangerous is the fact that in section 12 Congress would bring activities subject to State and local laws within the sphere of Federal jurisdiction and Federal regulation. The use of force or violence is traditionally subject to local law enforcement. Section 12 makes such acts Federal offenses. The scope and manner of picketing is regulated by State and local laws. Section 12 would make picketing subject to Federal control. In addition, section 12 outlaws various forms of strikes. It also makes labor organizations liable for suits by employers and subject to the court injunction. The provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act are made applicable to any situation covered by the section. This not only reinstates the use of the injunction in labor disputes but also permits the employer to impose a yellow-dog contract upon his employees. This is accomplished in this way. Any employee or labor organization found to have engaged in an unfair labor practice is deprived of the right of self-organization, the right to form or join a union, the right of collective bargaining, and all other rights conferred upon them by the National Labor Relations Act as amended. [Sec. 8 (b) and (c) and sec. 12 (d).] In addition, the Norris-LaGuardia Act is repealed in its entirety with respect to any action or proceeding in a Federal court involving any activity which section 12 defines as unlawful. [Sec. 12 (c).] As the result, if a worker participates in "picketing an employer's place of business in numbers," he is not only deprived of the right of union membership, but also may be required by the employer, as a condition of employment, to sign an individual contract not to join a labor organization.

It is important to note that, under the bill, when a union engages in an unfair labor practice, it promptly loses the right to its very existence, its existence becoming illegal for 1 year. Of course, no employer found guilty of an unfair labor practice is required to go out of business for 1 year. The employer must merely cease and desist from continuing such an unfair labor practice and take such affirmative action as may be necessary to comply with the law.

Enforcement of one right through the denial of another right is bad law. It is self-defeating. If all sinners were excommunicated from the church, sin would not be curbed but would become more widespread. The Wagner Act never contained any punitive provisions. The cease-and-desist orders, on which its enforcement is based, follow the tested and equitable procedure of the Federal Trade Commission Act designed to forbid unfair trade practices. Under that procedure, anyone found engaging in what the law holds to be an unfair practice, must stop the practice. But no one is sent to jail as a criminal or deprived of his civil rights.

Deprivation of the workers of their basic right of self-organization and collective bargaining will not further industrial peace. On the contrary, it will breed unrest. The proposed enactment is fraught with grave consequences to our society. Instead of removing the causes of industrial unrest, the authors of the bill attempt to outlaw its results. They deliberately close their eyes to the causes of industrial disputes. They ignore the contribution made by the free and voluntary self-organization of workers to a free society. They blindly trample upon the legitimate and lawful aspirations of American wage earners and seek to destroy the peaceful and constructive relationships and institutions which workers and employers have built up over a period of years. They would outlaw an effective peaceful picket line maintained by workers in seeking a legitimate economic objective. By doing so, they would drive workers from the economic picket lines to political picket lines, in search of a remedy against unfair and discriminatory laws. Today, after the national exertion of a world-wide war, when its attainment of economic stability at home is far from assured, when peace in the world surrounding it is not yet secure, our country can least afford the disruptive consequences which will inevitably flow from the adoption of laws imposing such far-reaching restrictions upon collective bargaining and upon organized labor.

TITLE II. CONCILIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES

This title, if enacted into law, would create a legislative monstrosity and result in a vast confusion of administrative responsibilities of conflicting agencies.

Having already created, in title I, a Labor Management Relations Board, an independent agency of the Government, and an office of Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act (also "an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government"), the authors of the bill establish in title II an Office of Conciliation, again "as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government," headed by a Director of Conciliation. But that is only the beginning. This title also authorized the President to make an independent finding that a labor dispute threatens to curtail commerce or services essential to public health, safety or interest. It then vests the Attorney General with the responsibility to petition a Federal district court for the injunction, and subsequently move for the court discharge of the injunction. At this stage the Administrator of the NLRA comes in to conduct a Government-supervised ballot. Next the Secretary of Labor steps in. Upon notification by the Secretary of Labor, the Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia must act. It is the duty of the Chief Justice to then convene a Special Advisory Settlement Board and to assume the chairmanship of that board. The special board renders an opinion in 30 days and 15 days later the Administrator of the NLRA comes back again to conduct another Government-supervised ballot among the employees, to find out how they feel about the special board's opinion. How the employer is to express his feeling about the special board's opinion is not stated. If one or both parties refuse to accept the special board's opinion, the dispute is back exactly where it started. To accomplish this result, the services of nine distinct and separate agencies of the Federal Government are utilized. And this is before we get to title III, where the United States Department of Labor is required to maintain a register and a file of financial reports of unions.

Overlapping jurisdiction and conflicting and unrelated responsibilities of this multiplicity of Government agencies and bureaus is bound to result in a confusion so profound that a special arbitrator would seem to be called for to resolve jurisdictional disputes among the independently acting agents of the Government. The procedures call for thousands of Federal agents, repeatedly conducting secret ballots, investigating and rendering reports. It requires mountains of administrative paper work incidental to Government record-keeping, reports, tabulations, and litigation in the courts. It necessitates huge outlays of public funds to sustain the workings of a teeming bureaucracy called upon to penetrate into every nook and cranny of business firms and of labor organizations.

Chairman FRED A. HARTLEY, of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in publishing the contents of the bill on April 10, said that the bill was "our response to the mandate that the people of the people of the United States gave us last November." We will not venture a guess to what group of people Congressman HARTLEY refers to as "the people of the people." We are sure, however, that he is misreading and misstating the

people's vote of last November. The November vote was a protest against a far-reaching Government bureaucracy and excessive Federal controls extended into peacetime. Then, as now, the people were fed up with governmental intervention into their private decisions and Government control of their private activities and transactions. It was a clear and ringing mandate against the very kind of legislative enactment Mr. HARTLEY has prepared for the consideration of Congress.

The proposed bill goes far beyond any known precedent in any field in peacetime Federal intervention. It extends Federal control to the very heart of the collective bargaining. It allows Federal authority to cut across the binding fiber of the private contract. It thrusts Federal Government jurisdiction into the area now reserved to the State and local jurisdiction. It writes a detailed script for collective-bargaining negotiations whereby labor and management reach agreement by Government mandate and not of their own accord, and places heavy penalties on those who would depart an iota from the Government-prescribed script. It regiments the actions of the workers and employers. It subjects free and voluntary organizations to all-embracing governmental control. It does all of these things, and more, and yet it is offered for the adoption by the Congress in the name of free enterprise.

Sections 201 and 202 remove the United States Conciliation Service from the United States Department of Labor where it has effectively functioned for many years and sets it up as an independent agency. It would forbid any employee of the Service to act as an arbitrator. The entire proposal militates against sound judgment, is diametrically opposed to the recommendations of the President's Labor-Management Conference and is supported by nothing but a scattered expression of a small minority of employers.

Sections 203 and 204 prescribe a special complex procedure to be followed in disputes found by the President to affect commerce in public utilities or services essential to public health, safety, or interest. The Norris-LaGuardia Act is repealed with respect to all such cases, permitting the widest reliance on the court injunction against unions. The proposed plan is directed entirely against labor and is completely one-sided. It provides for a compulsory submission of such disputes to a fact-finding special board, headed by the Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. It again requires a secret ballot of employees on the acceptability of the employer's last offer, without regard to the union proposal. By setting up a court of last resort, it promotes protracted disputes and would serve to thwart the possibility of a direct settlement. The plan would contribute nothing to the maintenance of industrial peace and would subject labor organizations and collective bargaining to oppressive Government regulation and control.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include as part thereof a statement by the American Federation of Labor with reference to H. R. 3020, pursuant to consent heretofore granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I feel just a little bit queer having the gentleman from North Carolina, a Democrat, make my speech for me, a Republican.

I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina that this is a nonpartisan problem; it is an American issue. What will make for a strong, virile, free, and solvent America? I regretted when I came to the Eightieth Congress and found I could no longer serve under the gentleman from North Carolina who was chairman of the Committee on Education of which I was a member. But I have become associated with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], and I have found him fair at all times. I have really enjoyed participating in the committee of which he is chairman and the work it has done. We worked sometimes until midnight. You get a real thrill by being privileged to play on his team. I have often thought that if all the people in New Jersey were like the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] I would like to go to New Jersey and meet more of them.

In considering the question before us today it seems to me that in general there are two approaches to it. How are we going to determine what are fair wages? Are we going to have governmental determination of wages, hours, and working conditions? Are we going to restore and maintain the traditional American wage system where economic laws rather than governmental edicts determine how much a man can get for what he has to offer the public, namely, his services, his labor?

It seems that in the past few years we have been going down the line toward governmental determination in this country. When we talk about liberalism and conservatism and antedated ways of doing things, to me we are harking back to the old European system of government saying what a man can do and what he cannot do.

We have had perhaps 150 witnesses appear before our committee. There were over 2,000,000 words of testimony. More than one-third of our witnesses were labor leaders. To a man almost all these labor leaders were of the opinion that the solution to our troubles would be greater union security and when we would ask them for their recommendation as to how to solve some of the abuses that have crept up, invariably they would recommend greater union security. If they did not have the closed shop they wanted that. If they did not have the check-off they would want that—always something to make the unions more powerful.

The question is whether that is the way the American people want to go on in the matter of settling what are fair wages, hours, and working conditions, and determining those matters, or whether we want to let economic rules govern and fix our wages and working conditions. Which method will make for a sustained rising standard for our working people? Which method will keep our people free? Of all union members, about 77 percent belong to what we call compulsory membership unions; about 30 percent of the 77 percent belong to the closed shop; about 27 percent to the union shop; about 20 percent to maintenance membership, and I think a small percentage in other forms.

This bill attempts to put a ban on the closed shop, and right there let me say that does not mean the unions will be completely crippled. In the Railway Labor Act the closed union shop and compulsory membership therein is specifically banned, yet since that time the railway brotherhood memberships have doubled and trebled.

Mr. Chairman, we are interested in individual freedom. We know that during the war and since there have been veterans who have come back. There were defense workers during the war who could not get a job unless they would first pay tribute to a union. We want to protect the individual's right to work without having to pay tribute for the privilege to work.

A lot of union leaders in this country have as a goal the universal closed shop, but we are fearful of what that would lead to in this country. Mr. Van Bitner, vice president of the CIO, when he was testifying before our committee, said that the OPA was as dead as a dodo bird. Now, I questioned that.

After all, if we go on making our determination of wages and hours and working conditions not by economic laws or by economic forces but by governmental determination, and if we let powerful unions set prices on wages, hours, and working conditions, we are going to find one of these days that by having a huge powerful labor monopoly, or the Government determining, if you please, wages, we are also going to have the Government determining commodity prices. There is a very close, definite relationship between wages, hours, and working conditions, and commodity prices, because 80 to 90 percent of most commodities is labor after all. So, if we go down the line we have been going with excessive unionism, union determination of wages, we are going to have the OPA back with all of its viciousness.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. Can the gentleman conceive of a closed shop in which the member of a union retains his economic freedom?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Well, of course, there have been closed shops for years and years and in many cases there were no abuses; in many cases the employer acquiesced willingly. But, it enables the union to have a stranglehold. It furthers the labor monopoly.

There are two powerful weapons that enable unions now to control or to fix prices and wages and working conditions and do it on a national scale. One is the closed shop and the other is industry-wide bargaining. They are the two eye teeth in this bill. They are the two things that we must take care of in this bill, or else it will be a milk-toast affair.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I think what the gentleman from New York was asking, without saying it specifically, is this: Would

it be possible for a workman working under such conditions to achieve his best effort, or would he be limited in his effort by a specific order? Could he be paid for what he does as compared with what the other man does? I think that is what the gentleman meant by "economic freedom."

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I will cover that in a moment. I think, personally, that perhaps industry-wide bargaining is the most important thing; overshadowing in importance all other things. In this bill we put a ban on industry-wide bargaining.

Industry-wide bargaining is undesirable for the following reasons: It places the public at the mercy of the labor monopoly. It impairs employer-employee relationships. It tends to result in political determination of conditions of employment and, lastly, wages cannot be set in relation to efficiency of producers. Individual effort is not given proper reward. Initiative and technological progress are stifled.

When you have union-wide, nation-wide, or industry-wide bargaining, whatever term you wish to call it, you destroy the keystone of our free economy, you destroy competition to a large degree. Talk about prices! The President of the United States says that we must lower prices or else raise wages. Why, with industry-wide bargaining it makes us have higher prices, because you in effect subsidize marginal producers, and in doing so allow too much profit to efficient producers; you do not have individual employers bargaining with their employees. You destroy competition, and competition, we have learned from experience in our country and in other lands, is the best regulator of prices the world has ever known. It keeps prices not too high and not too low, and when we stray very far afield and get away from competition and the fundamental economic rule, and substitute governmental rule, we get into plenty of trouble. Then, such a thing as a fair price or fair wage is only an accident.

So, I speak a good word for this bill. We must support the ban on industry-wide bargaining in this bill or we will go down the line toward a corporate state, statism, governmental determination of wages, hours, and working conditions, as well as commodity prices. Only by placing our reliance on fundamental economic laws rather than political forces can Americans remain free and solvent.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am impressed today at the number of experts we have on management and labor relations, so may I say before I start that I do not hold myself out as an expert but I do have some ideas about this piece of legislation perhaps a little bit different than those proposed.

In the first place I am a strong advocate of the President's proposal that we set up a commission to study this question, and not only the problem as it is represented by symptoms but by causes, because some of them are very fundamental. I do not think we have done that in this bill or that any Congress has gone far enough. I disagree with my distinguished chairman in that respect. He feels that he has done a good job, that he has gone far enough, but I do not.

It is significant that those who have been shouting the loudest against bureaucracy in Government and the expenditure of taxpayers' money should now be the loudest advocates of the establishment of an immense bureaucracy in Washington to govern and police the working people of America and which would require sums of money far in excess of the combined annual expenditures of the Conciliation Service and the National Labor Relations Board. It would be well for the taxpayers to take a little note of what is going on in Washington among our Republican friends.

The American public is being and has been propagandized on this subject of labor regulation for the obvious purpose of compelling this Congress to write in haste, without proper or adequate study, a bill to govern the activities of labor unions and, incidentally, adversely affect the unorganized groups. As has been said frequently, this kind of legislation would destroy labor organizations by destroying the right under the Constitution to band together in organizations for security and preservation. It is at the wage-earning men and women of America that this propaganda and legislation is directed. It is they and only they who are being persecuted.

There is little I can say that would change by one iota the purpose of the leadership in this House. What concerns me most is that legislation designed to correct certain evils should be written with such inadequate preparation, investigation, and study. This Congress has completely ignored the warning of the President in his State of the Union message that—

> We must not under stress of emotion endanger our American freedoms by taking ill-considered action which will lead to results not anticipated or desired.

Who is there to say that this proposed legislation does not run counter to the warning of the President? It will do just what he said—lead to results not anticipated or desired. The President also goes on to say:

> On June 11, 1946, in my message vetoing the Case bill I made a comprehensive statement of my views concerning labor-management relations. I said then, and I repeat now, that the solution of labor-management difficulties is to be found not only in legislation dealing directly with labor legislation but also in a program designed to remove the causes of insecurity felt by many workers in our industrial society.

Here lies the nub of labor unrest and labor disputes—insecurity. What has this Congress or any committee of this Congress done to study and discover the underlying causes of labor unrest? Exactly nothing. Instead time has been devoted to the tackling of symptoms, not causes. Would that Congress could cease being a medicine man and become a physician.

House Joint Resolution 83 has been lying in the House Labor Committee since January 23 of this year. This resolution called for six Members of the Senate, six Members of the House, and eight members to be appointed from the public by the President of the United States. This Commission was to make a complete and thorough study of the underlying causes of labor unrest and the report was to be in the hands of the President on or before June 1, 1947. It seems clear to me that had this resolution been acted on the material before the Congress by June 1 would have been the proper material to inform the Congress on labor-management-relation problems. How different this would have been from the program that has been carried out. As an illustration, the Committee on Economic Development, which is composed of some of the outstanding businessmen of the country, took 8 months for a study on how to m ke collective bargaining more effective. The Committee on Education and Labor attempted to cover the whole field of labor-management relations in a quarter of the time required by this business group to study only one phase of the subject.

Whatever else might be said about the great array of witnesses who appeared before the committee, it cannot be said that these witnesses bore complete, or accurate testimony on the basic problems affecting labor-management relations. Are we to legislate upon this kind of information? I hope not. I do not believe the American public would accept it. I do not believe the workers of this country would accept it. This legislation, if enacted, and even as it is proposed, will create bitterness in the hearts of the working people, for they will feel, and justly so, that their rights are being denied them.

We are all deeply concerned these days about the activities of the Communist Party, and yet in this type of legislation we cultivate and fertilize the soil for the sowing and reaping of communism. I was interested in reading recently an article in the March issue of Atlantic Monthly entitled "Can Labor Defeat the Communists?" by Meriyn Pitzele, who is labor editor of Business Week. The last two paragraphs are significant, and I quote them because they make my point much better than I myself could:

> If the growing tide of Communist power in the labor movement is to be turned and if it is not to become renascent, the public has two great responsibilities. It must first see that the unions are not broken by hasty, ill-considered, or dubiously motivated legislation passed in a mood of hysteria engendered by strikes. Breaking established union institutions would drive the American labor movement underground and deliver it lock, stock, and barrel to the Communist Party. Only the Communists have the competence for running conspiratorial organizations in America today, and when the labor movement did come up again from underground, it would be brought up by them as a full-fledged revolutionary vanguard prepared to fight for state power.
>
> Finally, most important of all, there exists the public obligation, which no citizen can escape, to prevent another depression. With their present resources, give the Communists national unemployment on anything like the scale of the early thirties and they will use it to seize more than part of the labor movement. Nothing that could happen in this country or in the world would better serve their power drive or the interests of their masters in Moscow.

So, in our activities we are perfectly oblivious to the needs of vast millions of working people in our country. We permitted the cost of living to rise, we destroyed what few regulations we had, and permitted shortages to occur in the basic necessities of life—all with the idea that business itself would take care of production and prices. Then we proceeded to take from the hands of the working people the instrumentalities which they have for their own improvement. And, then, we wonder why strange "isms" will creep into the minds of these people. The living standards of every American family are threatened by this bill. Not only organized, but unorganized, workers will be driven to lower standards of living. Hunger and insecurity will come into their homes. All of our workers, industrial workers, clerks, white-collar workers, salesmen, will be hurt by the enactment of this legislation. Strangely enough there was very little testimony before our committee with relation to the average wage today, the cost of living today, the inevitable depression which is coming, although these are basic considerations in the problem.

This bill, H. R. 3020, was written around certain premises. For instance, someone said at sometime that the rank and file members of labor unions are coerced and compelled to follow leaders which they do not like, that undemocratic practices are followed in the affairs of labor unions. How was this determined? Who is capable of saying these these accusations are true or false? Certainly, no investigation was made of these charges, and they are only two of many. Can it be assumed that over 14,000,000 working people of America join labor unions because they are coerced or threatened? Those who say that, they have no understanding of the impending motives which cause people to band together in labor organizations. There may be instances of coercion having taken place, but such a great number of people must have been willing to unionize voluntarily. Why have these charges not been investigated? Why do we close our eyes to a complete examination of them? That is one of the mystifying things, and the only conclusion one can draw is that we do not want to know the truth, that we want to believe what appeals to us most. I know from personal experience that many of these charges are not true. I know how eager working people are to have the opportunity to join labor organizations. I know that threats or violence or intimidation cannot keep them away from organization meetings.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to say for the benefit of the Members of the House that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is in the coal-mining business in private life, and he has had a great deal more experience with the hiring of labor than the average Member of this House. Therefore, I think the words he is giving us come from the standpoint of an employer who has had experience in the hiring of many people.

Mr. KELLEY. I thank the gentleman.

I wish everyone could have the opportunity to read the minority report, and the majority report along with it. I believe the reader would be convinced that there is much confusion in the minds of those who support H. R. 3020. I believe the reader will find that the minority report clearly points out the danger of this drastic amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, of the host of unfair labor practices by employees, of the destruction of union security, of the amendments to the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Corrupt Practices Act, and others, and shows beyond a doubt that the ultimate objective of the bill is to weaken labor unions in their collective-bargaining procedures. I believe the reader will readily see that this bill is entirely in opposition to the wisdom of the President's proposal.

It should be borne in mind here that all management is not interested in this kind of legislation. We have been hearing from a most articulate and vociferous group in management, but I am not convinced that this group speaks for management as a whole. I think management would find this legislation a nuisance. If the managers think they have trouble now, just let them try to operate under this proposed legislation. They will be coming down here to Congress and crying to high heaven for relief. If the legislators who are the proponents of this measure imagine for 1 minute that it is going to bring peace between labor and management, they are in for a sudden and serious awakening. The American workingman is a long-suffering individual, as past history will prove, but he will subject himself to chains only so long. The day will always come when he will rise up and smite his enemies. The supporters of H. R. 3020 must overlook the fact that anything that circumscribes the liberties of the workingman and his right to improve his working conditions and security is violently resented, because it is not only he but his family who is affected. It is the threatened impoverishment of his children, the deprivation of proper food and clothing and education, which creates bitterness in him. So we had better weigh well the consequences of any kind of legislation that affects the intimate life of our working people.

In any legislation we should attempt to raise the standard of living, not drive it down. All society is benefited by such a positive approach rather than a negative one. We should not forget that there are between 55 and 60 million working people in this country who have families. They are the great bulk of our population. The imposition of this kind of legislation by a few is contrary to the concepts of a free people. Again I say that what we need at this time are enlightened physicians, not medicine men.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL].

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to speak a word of praise concerning our chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]. He has worked day and night and has been preeminently fair. It has been a pleasure to serve under him.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time in any bill submitted to this House for vote, the American workingman is to be protected from the unfair labor practices of labor organizations, by provisions which, in effect, constitute a bill of rights for workers. Some refer to these provisions as union democracy. They are definite steps forward in the emancipation of the individual worker. They are distinct gains for the worker. In view of that fact, is it not strange that the labor leaders who appeared before the committee suggested none of these provisions? Probably the most noteworthy feature of the hearings was the almost uniform opposition of the labor leaders to any changes in the present labor laws. They urged us to let well enough alone. If the past and present conditions were good, if labor peace exists, then their argument would be sound, and would be most persuasive. But you know the facts prove otherwise.

The words of the testimony piled up story after story of violence, intimidation, and extortion, community paralysis, conspiracies to stop the necessities of life—food, fuel, transportation, and communications—conspiracies to restrict production, and to control prices; denial of rights to employ, or be employed; denial of free speech; invasion and suppression of democratic processes by the Federal agencies, in collusion with union tyranny; denial of home rule to workers; communistic infiltration and un-Americanism.

The labor leaders brush aside these examples of union coercion, violence, and communistic domination by saying they are but isolated cases. Mr. Chairman, we were able to obtain only a sampling in such a short period of time, but the record clearly discloses a distinct pattern, extending from Connecticut to California, and from Wisconsin to Alabama.

The record of the testimony, the public-opinion polls, and the mail from people throughout the length and breadth of the land, demand correction of these conditions. They cry out for the adoption of fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another; for the protection of the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations and employers; and for the recognition that the public interest is paramount in labor disputes affecting commerce, which endanger the health, safety, or welfare of all our citizens.

The bill before you today seeks to accomplish these purposes. Yet we find these same labor leaders who refused to cooperate in any way during the hearings, who stated that no changes were needed, who were contemptuous of Members of Congress attempting to find a proper solution of these problems, now launching a propaganda campaign to smear the bill and those who participated in its preparation. The familiar slogans of "antilabor," "reactionary,"

"Fascists," and so forth, are hurled forth in every direction.

Actually, how unfair to the individual laboring man is this bill? Page after page speaks of the rights of the employee, of the workingman; and sets up provisions to safeguard them. Would the labor leaders wish to eliminate them? Would they wish to do away with the provisions to safeguard the public interest in certain types of strikes?

The bill continues the right of the workingman to organize and bargain collectively. Not one word—and this should be emphasized, Mr. Chairman, not one word—calls for lower wages, or poorer working conditions. It recognizes his right to select his own bargaining representative by secret ballot, free from any coercion from an employer or a labor organization. It sets up procedures for collective bargaining, instead of following the hit-or-miss methods of the past, which only led to friction and misunderstanding between employer and employee over the question as to whether or not collective bargaining had actually taken place. Methods are prescribed to insure that the workingman will be informed of the issues of a dispute, the areas of agreement and disagreement, the latest offer of the employer, and then the opportunity by secret ballot to decide for himself, whether he wishes to accept the latest offer of the employer or to strike.

Under the designation of unfair labor practices, an employer cannot interfere with an employee in the formation or administration of a labor union, nor can the employer refuse to bargain collectively with the representative selected by the employee, nor can the employer discharge an employee because he filed charges or testified under this bill, nor can an employer deduct money from an employee's own pay check for union dues, fees, or assessments without written permission of the employee, who has the right to withdraw this permission at any time on 30 days' written notice.

Are these provisions antilabor?

And here are the new provisions, defining the unfair labor practices on the part of a labor organization: Unions cannot interfere or coerce individuals in their right to organize or bargain collectively, nor can they compel them to become or remain a member of any labor organization. They cannot normally charge initiation fees greater than $25 per member, nor charge dues that are not uniform for the same class of members, nor sell work permits, nor deny any member the right to resign from a union at any time. A labor organization cannot deny a secret ballot on any question involving fees, dues, assessments, fines, striking, or union policy; nor fail to hold elections of officers at least every 4 years; nor expel or suspend any member without an opportunity to be heard, or on any ground other than, first, nonpayment of dues; second, disclosing confidential information of the labor organization; third, participating in a violation of a collective-bargaining agreement of his union; fourth, being a member of or promoting the Communist Party; fifth, conviction of a felony; sixth, scandalous conduct, tending to bring the labor organization into disrepute.

A labor union cannot fine or discriminate against any member because he criticized the organization or its officers, or because he failed to contribute, support, or vote for some candidate for civil or labor organization office; nor can a labor organization employ or direct any person to spy upon any member, or intimidate his family, or injure the person or property of a member or his family.

Are these bill-of-rights provisions antilabor?

This bill seeks to protect the freedom of the individual worker. It attempts to emancipate him from abuses of power by either a labor organization or an employer. Again, let it be stressed—not one word calls for lower wages or poorer working conditions.

Does the individual worker know that?

Has he been informed of all the provisions in this bill?

Does he consider the entire bill antilabor?

Why not let the individual worker decide for himself?

He and the public should be the real judges in the last analysis.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the National Labor Relations Act which was enacted 12 years ago, has been known as labor's bill of rights. It was intended to encourage collective bargaining between employer and employee. It gave employees freedom to join unions without employer interference. When the practice of collective bargaining is universally accepted in good faith by the American employer and employee, we will enjoy industrial peace.

I am opposed to H. R. 3020, known as the Hartley bill, because it practically nullifies the Wagner Act. It also complicates and weakens the collective-bargaining procedure. Collective bargaining between employer and employee is democracy in action.

In 1935 when the Wagner Act was passed, less than 4,000,000 wage earners were unionized. Today there are approximately 15,000,000 in both affiliated and independent unions. Since 1935, wages, working conditions, and living conditions have greatly improved, not only for the 15,000,000 union members, but also for approximately 30,000,000 other American wage earners.

One of the greatest accomplishments of the Wagner Act has been that it protected the employee if he desired to join a union. Previous to the Wagner Act, most individual wage earners were unable to bargain on an equal plane with their employers. Most employers asserted their economic power by destroying the wage earners' attempt to pool their numerical strength. It was then impossible to establish that equality of position between the parties in which true liberty of contract begins. You cannot have collective bargaining until employees are free to act without fear of employer retaliation.

The Wagner Act was designed to protect and to encourage the institution of collective bargaining as marriage laws are designed to protect and encourage the institution of the family. But happy labor relations are no more guaranteed by the one than happy domestic relations are by the other. In the field of labor relations, the human element is very important. Attitudes, mutual forebearance, and consideration, are no less important than in family relations.

We are emerging from the economic aftereffect of the greatest war in all history.

Since VJ-day, the take-home pay of the industrial worker has decreased over 30 percent. The wartime 48-hour week was reduced to 40 hours. The cost of living in industrial areas has sky-rocketed 35 percent since the shooting war stopped. The major portion of this unreasonable increase in the cost of food, clothing, and so forth, took place since price control was ruined last June with the power of the Republican leadership leading the execution.

A great number of employers who testified at hearings on this bill, admitted that reduced take-home pay and the increased cost of living since VJ-day contributed greatly to labor unrest and strikes during the last year and a half.

Last June the Republicans in Congress killed price control and the cost of living has skyrocketed. This impossible economic situation is the cause of our industrial unrest. Congress should try and solve the high cost of living problem instead of trying to saddle the so-called Hartley bill on the backs of the American wage earners. The Hartley bill will promote industrial confusion and chaos and postpone reconversion beyond measure.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Committee on Education and Labor held hearings for a period of 5 weeks. The vast majority of the witnesses who testified before the committee were bitterly antilabor and a great number were employers who had experienced labor difficulties and strikes. On questions propounded by some of the minority members, it was revealed that practically all the employer witnesses had made no effort to comply with the collective-bargaining provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. Press releases were given almost daily during these hearings by the chairman and some of the Republican members in order to build up a case against union labor in the minds of the American public. In a number of instances, witnesses testifying in behalf of union labor were heckled, interrupted, and silenced so they were unable to present their views in a coherent fashion. On the other hand, witnesses who were offering testimony in criticism and opposition to the Wagner Act or union labor, were listened to in courteous silence by the majority members of the committee. If they failed to make a point, there was always a helpful Republican Congressman ready, alert, and willing to explain his meaning more clearly.

After the public hearings closed, the committee members of the majority party held secret sessions and proceeded to write H. R. 3020, known as the Hartley

bill. The majority of the minority members were excluded from these meetings. For over 2 weeks the iron curtain was drawn against most of the minority members, and, finally the gentleman from New Jersey, Chairman HARTLEY, called an executive meeting of the committee for 1 p. m. on last Thursday, April 10, to vote on this bill. The minority members received a copy of this bill a few hours before the committee meeting. The Member from Indiana, now addressing the House, moved that the executive committee meeting be postponed until 10 a. m. the following Monday to give the minority members an opportunity to study this 68-page document of labor legislation. I asked that we be given time to acquaint ourselves with the complicated mechanism of this highly involved bill. My motion did not prevail.

Since becoming a Member of this House, I have served on the Post Office and Post Roads Committee. During that service, former Chairman Burch, of the Post Office Committee, did not at any time call together the majority members formally or informally to the exclusion of the minority members. During the last session, I served on the Naval Affairs Committee. At no time did the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman CARL VINSON, call the majority members of the committee formally or informally to the exclusion of the minority members. In composing this legislation, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, with the cooperation of the majority members, succeeded in practically eliminating the two-party system as far as the legislative operations of this committee are concerned. I am confident that when the membership of this House, after listening to the debate in the Committee of the Whole and making a thorough study of the complex, highly involved legalistic structure and the restrictive provisions which will, if enacted, deny the wage earner of America adequate collective-bargaining protection, the now apparent solid Republican endorsement of this bill will be greatly shattered.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The Supreme Court has often pointed out that collective bargaining under the present act, means "negotiating in good faith." Yet nowhere in the definition of collective bargaining in this act is there any reference to good faith. The parties are required to hold at least five conferences during a 30-day period to discuss the issues in the dispute. But the 30-day period does not begin to run until the first conference has been held. It vaguely requires that this conference must be held within a reasonable time after receipt of proposal by one party. This would avail an obstinate employer numerous delaying tactics to the detriment of the wage earner. The only course of the wage earner in the face of such tactics would be the filing of an unfair labor practice before the board. After a long period necessary for a hearing and appeal, the employer might be ordered to bargain collectively. During this period, the wage earner would be denied the use of his only weapon, his constitutional right to strike.

If the parties could not reach an agreement during the so-called 30-day period, the employees would still be prevented from engaging in a strike to enforce their demands because of further procedural requirements which by their nature would bring further delay. Thus the employer would be given a reasonable time to inform the employees of the issues and his last offer of settlement. And again, after the employees are so informed, the administrator is given a reasonable time to provide for the required secret ballot. Even if the administrator desires to expedite the balloting, the present practice of the majority party of denying sufficient funds to labor agencies in the executive branch of the Government, would undoubtedly make it impossible to employ sufficient personnel to hold such elections promptly.

The provision requiring the union and the employer to make separate summations of the issues and their positions on the issues to the employees is another delaying maneuver. The method of presenting the issue would resolve itself into a confusing propaganda campaign. Each side would attempt for position in a more favorable light.

From the above, one can plainly see that this legislation is a clever maneuver to destroy collective bargaining and deny the wage earner his only weapon to better his working conditions and income, to wit: the right to strike.

CHECK-OFF

This bill makes it an unfair-labor practice for employers to make deductions from employees' compensation for union dues, known as the check-off.

This system, whereby pay-roll deductions are made for payment to union organizations of certain authorized funds, is well established in the American industrial pattern and widespread in its application.

In the manufacturing industries alone, nearly 5,000,000 workers, approximately 50 percent of all workers in this industry, had their union dues checked off in 1946. Both in effect and in theory, the subject of the check-off is a legitimate subject of contract and meets with the approval of the great majority of manufacturers.

THE CLOSED SHOP AND UNION SECURITY

This bill makes it an unfair-labor practice for an employer to require membership in a union as a condition of employment.

The effect of this section outlaws the closed-shop provisions in existing contracts covering millions of workers and would result in nullifying many of these contracts in their entirety. The result would be chaos and confusion of industrial relations in vast and vital sectors of our economy. Union security agreements have a recognized function in industrial relations. Such agreements prevent nonunion workers from sharing in the benefits resulting from union activities without also sharing in the obligations. They are a manifestation of the democratic principle of majority rule and the sharing of the obligations by a minority in return for benefits received. They prevent the weakening of labor organizations by discrimination against union members, and eliminate the lowering of standards caused by competition with nonunion workers, and thereby promote higher efficiency and productivity. They give to labor organizations a sense of security from attack by rivals and thereby facilitate good relations with management. They also enable union leaders to devote more attention to administration of collective agreements and less to defending themselves against raiding.

If this bill were designed, among other things, to outlaw the closed shop, closed union arrangement only, and to permit union security arrangements that were not based on the closed union practice, it has gone far beyond what was needed to achieve that purpose. This, in effect, means that the union is shorn of its power to discipline its own members for good cause.

DENIAL OF INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

In outlawing industry-wide bargaining, this bill disregards the fact that employers compete with one another, both as to the price and quality of their product and for labor. It is unthinkable, for example, that the large steel manufacturers, all of whom compete for labor in the Indiana Calumet area, can pay a different wage scale. Yet, this provision would necessarily mean that the wage levels of entire industries would be forced down to the lowest level which any substantial group of employees were inclined to, or could, accept.

Under this subsection of the bill a union that has been designated as a collective-bargaining representative would be ineligible to be certified as the representative of the employees of any competing employer, unless the employees involved are less than 100 in number and the plants of the employers involved are less than 50 miles apart. A provision more inconsistent with the policy of the bill set out in section 1, to minimize industrial strife and to encourage peaceful settlement of labor disputes, could scarcely be imagined.

The impairment of industry-wide bargaining that might well follow from the enactment of this bill would upset existing collective-bargaining pratices which have proved successful in many industries and made important contributions to industrial peace.

Employers as much as employees have benefited from this practice and have testified in favor of its continuance. Such widely varied employer groups as the men's clothing industry, the full-fashioned hosiery, ship building, and the maritime industries have testified to the efficacy of industry-wide bargaining as a means of promoting stability and peace in industrial relations.

Experience has shown also that industry-wide bargaining has made a valuable contribution to the promotion and maintenance of fair standards in wages, hours, and working conditions, to the benefit not only of the living standards of the wage earners of this country but also the prosperity of the employers in the industry. The stabilization of wage rates through industry-wide bargaining has helped to discourage unfair competition with respect to wage rates and has

enabled the great majority of fair-minded employers to operate at the American level of fair play and decency.

Although the sponsors of this proposal undoubtedly did not intend it, one of the significant effects of any weakening of industry-wide bargaining would be to seriously impair the bargaining power of many employers. Unions would be aided in a policy of picking off employers one by one. Employers who sought to protect themselves against such tactics by organizing and bargaining as a unit would be hurt by a limitation on industry-wide bargaining. On the other hand, unscrupulous labor racketeers or radical elements would be free to follow a policy of divide and conquer. That is the reason why small employers, particularly, look to industry-wide bargaining as their only hope of gaining some approximation of equality with large and powerful unions.

CONCLUSION

I would heartily endorse any practical legislation that would aid in eliminating industrial disputes. Had the Congress followed President Truman's recommendation in his State of the Union message, we would be well on our way toward common-sense and stable legislation for industrial peace. The President recommended that the Congress create a temporary joint commission to inquire into the entire field of labor-management relation, composed of 12 Members of Congress chosen by Congress and 8 members representing the public, management, and labor. He suggested that this commission investigate and make recommendations on certain changes, such as:

First. Nation-wide strikes in vital industries affecting the public interest;

Second. Methods and procedures for carrying out the collective-bargaining process; and

Third. The underlying cause of management-labor disputes.

The consuming public of America well remembers President Truman's request a year ago that Congress continue price control and keep down the cost of living. Had the above recommendations of our President been followed, the cost of living would have been controlled and increased wage demands and industrial disputes would not be haunting the American people today. The responsibility for the rejection of the above request of President Truman can be laid at the door of the Republican leadership in Congress. In its place the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress is now presenting to the American people this legislative monstrosity known as H. R. 3020, the Hartley labor bill.

I am fearful that if this bill is enacted into law in its present form, industrial democracy in America will be shattered. Living wages, good working conditions, and future security for the American home is the greatest bulwark we have against fascism and communism.

Since VJ-day we have been struggling with peacetime reconversion and gradually overcoming the natural aftermath of the greatest war in our history. I hope the Congress will not impede our fight to return to peacetime prosperity by enacting this legislation and discouraging over 50,000,000 wage earners of the Nation.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] who has just addressed the Committee, criticized this bill because it would, said he, in effect nullify the Wagner Act. I, for one, wish it did. If this bill could simply read, "The Wagner Act of 1934 is hereby repealed, period," this would be a great law and a great day in American jurisprudence.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I was quite concerned early in the afternoon when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in good faith asked a question, not for or against this bill, but which impugned, to a great extent, the honor of Congress. The question was not answered. I asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] to yield and he refused to yield. I also asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and he did not yield. The gentleman from Massachusetts asked the question or made the statement that there had been a rumor that someone has lobbied, not before the committee, not in testimony, not in the open, but as if it had reached hotel rooms, as has been reported in some of the newspapers.

What I as a Member of Congress would like to know is whether any Congressman has met on this bill with groups in hotel rooms. If so, their names should be given out; if not, such implications and innuendos should not be made.

With all the testimony that has been heard on this bill in the open light of day in the committee room in the presence of members of both sides, I wish to ask a member of the committee what I was going to ask both the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Massachusetts, but they refused to yield to me.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for asking the question as to how the bill was drawn and where. It has also been recorded that this is the first time in something like 14 years that a major bill of this kind has actually been drawn in the Congress and in the Congressmen's own rooms. I suppose it may be an occasion for wonder. I believe I worked with the committee nearly every night after the hearings. As you know, the hearings ran for 7 weeks. When we had finished examining witnesses during the day about the only time the Members had to work was at night, and various Members were working continuously, sometimes until 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning in their own rooms.

I know of no occasion when any Member met with others in hotel rooms in connection with the drawing of this bill.

There are seven or eight lawyers on the majority side of the committee and they worked long hours and late on these provisions.

We did have the advice and counsel of Jerry Morgan, who was the counsel of the committee for 15 years. He worked very diligently on the bill; but we had the benefit of his knowledge and advice as the Democrats themselves had for 15 years prior to this year. We have had, of course, a tremendous number of proposed bills offered to us in the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have a very high regard for Jerry Morgan, and I know him in connection with the legislative service, but is he still connected with the legislative service of the Congress?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I do not know.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand he is not, that he is now outside of Government service. Now, with no reflection on Mr. Morgan, the gentleman has given a piece of evidence which shows that a very able man, but a man with outside connections, assisted in the drafting of the bill. There is no impugning of motives, for he is a very fine gentleman and I have a very high regard for him, but I understand Mr. Morgan is no longer connected with the legislative counsel of the House.

I proceed no further because under no condition would I personally draw any inferences of his sincerity or that of those associated with him, but I understand he is no longer connected with the House organization.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for not drawing any inferences. I hope those who have any inferences to draw will specify the names and places where they say conferences took place outside the corridors of this Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The thing that really is important is the substance of this bill and not who helped prepare the bill. Is not that true?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It makes no real difference where you get the benefit of certain information; you can take it and use it or not as you see fit. There is not a Member of this Congress, including the leadership on the Democratic side, that does not receive suggestions and advice from all sorts of people.

As far as I am concerned, and as far as any decent Member of Congress is concerned, I expect to legislate as I see fit, taking all of the information I can receive from any and all sources, using my own judgment and my own conscience and what little intelligence God gives me to write the kind of legislation I believe will be proper for the Congress to pass upon.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I thank the gentleman for referring to the fact that the real test is whether or not we know a good idea when we see one.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not a fact that a man by the name of Van Bittner, now connected with the CIO, testified

before your committee that he wrote the famous Wagner Act?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I am glad the gentleman mentions that. We almost had a fist fight between Van Bittner and Green as to which one wrote the Wagner bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What difference does it make who wrote it if Congress finds it is a good law and passes it?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I do not think there should be any difference at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very much interested in the general observation made by the outstanding brain of the Republican Party in the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope he will very carefully check what he just said and put some very sharp limitations upon it, because it is important whom one works with at times. Certainly if there were a power lobby operating up there and they were sitting in in connection with the drafting of a bill, I know the gentleman would not stand for that. The gentleman has opened up a lot of questions. His statement is general, and I suggest to my friend that he very carefully edit what he said because he stated in his general remarks that anything can go. Well, everything cannot go under certain conditions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman from New York for the distinct benefit of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I stand upon this statement, that after all the thing that counts in connection with legislation is the legislation itself. Why I have even known of good ideas, legislatively speaking, coming from the Democratic side of the aisle in this House. I have supported such legislative ideas, not because of the source from which they came but, rather, because they stood on their own feet and my own judgment, my own conscience, my own intellect told me they were good suggestions. Perhaps the gentleman may find good suggestions in many different sources in this life of ours. Even Tommy Corcoran and our friend Cohen, the famous writers of the "must" legislation of the New Deal days, brought bills up here that the gentlemen of this House accepted without question at all, some of the great legislation for which some Members I see on the floor have received great credit. That came from individuals who were in no way connected with the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry I put my friend on the defensive so much.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman does not have me on the defensive, but, rather, he is in the position where he will have the opportunity to explain some of the discrepancies of the past.

I would like to conclude by saying to the gentleman from New York that the testimony given before the Rules Committee indicated very clearly that this bill was the legislative work of the members of this committee. While it is true that most of the work on this bill was done by the Republican members of the committee, that is nothing new or nothing unusual. The Republicans have been doing most of the work for a long while in this Congress. The Republican Party now has the responsibility for preparing and bringing legislation to this floor for action. That is exactly what this committee has done, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacKINNON. I would like to answer the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DINGELL. Where?

Mr. GWINN of New York. In room 547, Old House Office Building.

Mr. MacKINNON. Who asked that question?

Mr. DINGELL. I did.

Mr. MacKINNON. I thought so. I may say this, in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, that immediately after the conclusion of our hearings and before a word was put on paper, and without any outside lobbying or interference, we voted as to how we stood on every single controversial proposition in this bill.

This legislation in its present form, while it is not in conformance with the wishes or desires of any single member of the committee, conforms exactly to what the committee members on the Republican side voted for, plus the final amendments that were made when the bill went to the full committee. In the earlier actions I understand that Democratic Members who were friendly to the idea of legislation were contacted, and I personally discussed some of the issues with some of them. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am just simply inquiring. The gentleman mentioned Jerry Morgan's name. The Republican members met by themselves, did they?

Mr. MacKINNON. That is right, and consulted with the friendly Democrats.

Mr. GWINN of New York. With further reference to the gentleman from Indiana, who is a member of the committee, and his complaint about not having more time to work on this bill. He was like Mr. Green and Mr. Bittner and Mr. Murray, who testified that positively not a dot nor the crossing of a "t" should be changed on their bill, and that was the attitude for more than 2 days of the gentleman from Indiana who voted against every provision. We naturally assumed that if we went on for days, his attitude towards this bill would be the same. I trust we have not missed anything.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from New York is incorrect when he states that I voted against every provision. I voted "present" a number of times.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am glad to be corrected.

Now, the reason this bill has to be changed, if we are going to have any legislation at all to improve our labor relations, is illustrated by the provision that exempts supervisors. You know, the original bill was enacted to protect labor from bosses—from so-called powerful combinations of employers. Nobody ever dreamed that the rank-and-file leadership would get around and finally press the supervisors—the foremen in the plants—to make them join a union. After a while they saw it worked so well that they said, "He is our boss now, but we will take him in and then we will boss him." By the same token, after a while, they can take in the vice presidents of the company and say, "Let us boss the whole outfit." They could do it because they have such tremendous votes. They could take in or exclude anybody in their bargaining unit that they wanted to take in. So this law simply excludes supervisors. They cannot belong to a rank-and-file union organization; they are supposed to represent management; they are supposed to direct and to discipline and to be loyal to the management's point of view.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the bill provide any kind of union for foremen or supervisors?

Mr. GWINN of New York. It does not. It simply excludes them. Supervisors or foremen may organize as they did before the Wagner Act, but they have no standing under this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But it does absolutely prohibit affiliation with a rank and file union.

Mr. GWINN of New York. It does.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. May I ask if a gentleman by the name of Theodore Eiserman ever sat in with the majority Members and aided in the drafting of the bill?

Mr. GWINN of New York. Theodore Eiserman, as you know, was what we thought one of our best witnesses. He introduced not only a fine statement on the law, but introduced his own book, and on occasion I conferred with him in my office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN of New York. One other reason why this bill must be amended is that men who violate the law have been exempted from the processes of the law under the Wagner Act. One of the most evil things that has been rolling up under

this bill for the last 14 years is utter lawlessness and violence, because men who commit violence cannot be prosecuted successfully under the Wagner Act supported by the LaGuardia Act. Listen to this language which has been set aside by this new bill. It is an astonishing statement when you set it alongside the lawlessness for which there has been no remedy. This is section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act:

No officer or member of any association or organization, and no association or organization participating or interested in a labor dispute, shall be held responsible or liable in any court of the United States for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents, except upon clear proof of actual participation in, or actual authorization of, such acts, or of ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof.

The interpretation of these acts by the Board and the courts has been that respectable robbery could be committed without liability. The new Hartley Act now before us for passage changes that and makes all men subject to the law and subject to damages for unlawful, concerted, monopolistic acts to destroy property and to injure persons.

This is one more step back to the restoration of freedom, one more rededication of Government to its primary function of protecting individual freedom in America. The sum total of many individual freemen is the fundamental source of a good society. The formation of groups to exercise compulsion and intimidation over individual men ends in strife and violence which has multiplied threefold since the Wagner Act.

The American workman who was once free has been cajoled, coerced, intimidated, and on many occasions beaten up for the alleged good of the group he was forced to join. His whole economic life has been subject to the complete domination and control of unregulated monopolists. To get a job he has had to pay them. He has been forced to join these groups against his will because he feared them. At other times when he has desired to join a group he trusted he has been forced to join one he has mistrusted. He has been compelled to pay assessments for causes and candidates for public office which he opposed. He has been shut up in meetings and fined or expelled for expressing his own mind about right and wrong on public issues. He has been denied the right to arrange the terms of his own employment. He has frequently, against his will, been called out on strikes and violence which have resulted in wage losses representing years of his savings. He has been ruled by Communists and other subversive influences because he has had no right to vote. In short his mind, his soul, and his very life have been subject to a tyranny more despotic than one could think possible in a free country.

The committee report finds the employer's plight has been equally bad and dangerous. He has played an unhappy enforced part in rising prices and reduced production and resulting scarcity under a new form of monopoly called laboristic monopoly. He has been required to employ or reinstate individuals who have assaulted him and his employees and want only to destroy his property. When he has tried to discharge Communists and trouble makers he has been prevented from doing so by a board which called this union bating. He has had to stand by helpless while employees desiring to enter his plant legally to work have been obstructed by violence, mass picketing, and general rowdyism. He has been unable to speak against irresponsible slander, abuse, and vilification against him.

His business often has been brought to a standstill by jurisdictional fights and disputes for which he himself had no responsibility or possibility of settling. And finally, he has been compelled by the laws of the greatest democratic country in the world to be a part of a rising tide of industrial warfare three times greater than ever before witnessed, in this land of 165 years of liberty, because of the Wagner Act.

The public has suffered most of all.

By default in our legislative branch of Government, Americans have been separated into contending factions because they have ignored and set aside established constitutional law. The administrative and judicial departments of our Government have with equal shame participated.

This is the sordid story unfolded before the committee in its hearings.

RESUMPTION OF AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

The bill is a restatement of the inalienable rights of the individual and a rededication of Government to its primary function of protecting those rights of individuals. It has been drafted on the principle that when individual rights are protected and free men are truly free in their life, work, and pursuit of happiness, as our Constitution provides, the whole of society achieves its greatest good.

The bill rejects the contention that organized groups may assert and force an individual to give up his basic rights for any alleged higher right of a group. The committee finds such so-called group rights lead to the exploitation of individuals as well as of the public generally.

Now there hangs over the Nation a silent, sullen resignation of millions of men and women who have paid hundreds of millions of dollars each year to organized forces of compulsion that they do not trust but fear to resist or offend.

This bill holds that no individual can be compelled by another individual to pay tribute for the privilege of starting to work, or monthly dues for the privilege of continuing to work, or fines wherein a mere individual man assumes to be master over another. It stops the growth of strife and even violence that results from compulsion or assumption of power of one man over another. This bill is designed to break up the organization of monopolistic-group control over the individual's freedom to contract for the exchange of his own goods and services. It should protect the rights of the willing buyer and seller in a free market. It should stop the exercise of power of any group over the individual to the point where the group controls the number who can work, the amount of production, and fixes monopolistic prices in its organized effort to exploit the public generally for the special benefit of the group itself. It should stop the growth of the group in its compulsory unionism as it stopped monopoly group power of industry 50 years ago. It recognizes and deals with the dangerous expansion of unionism into a kind of labor cartel, a complete monopoly.

The whole of society is even now deprived of coal, telephones, steel, motors, food, and houses, and compelled to bow to its labor masters as the members of the union themselves have been compelled to do. For example, they have maintained the costs of building houses at such high prices—costs of building houses being nearly 100 percent labor, past or present—and thereby so reduced production that more than one-half of the people are unable to build houses at all. More than one-half of the families of this Nation receive less than $6 a day. Obviously, they cannot pay lumbermakers, carpenters, bricklayers, masons, painters, plumbers, and others an average of $20 a day and more. Neither can they get the services of young men, veterans, nonunion men, free men, to exchange their services on equal terms with them. Such men, when they volunteer or respond to the pressing need, are called scabs, enemies of the organized group and by violence and threat of violence, prevented from entering this field of work by goons that have become the law of the land in whole states.

So the committee finds once more as our country has found before, that freedom alone can cure the evil effects that beset us. Individuals under freedom are so much more honest and productive than groups of individuals organized deliberately to defeat freedom, reduce production, and raise prices.

Finally, this bill rises in protest not only against industrial strangulation but against the expansion of political groups—the twin brothers of industrial groupism. Power, starting with industrial power, grows from one group into still larger groups, step by step, until they are finally united in the governing group. Smaller collectivist groups become one collectivist group, one party power which subjugates at last all other groups. The American people in greater numbers have united, undoubtedly greater than those who united for the first struggle of freedom and constitutional government, greater than those united in the Civil War and in the war against monopolistic control by industrial combines, 50 years ago. We shall win this battle again for freedom because the people are united and determined to win.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

HOW THE BILL IS LOADED AGAINST LABOR

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, the bill is hypocritical and one-sided.

The bill is sponsored by those who profess to abhor Federal regulation, yet it is the most involved and complicated regulatory code which has ever been imposed in the history of industrial relations.

The bill is sponsored by believers in States' rights, yet it federalizes the most minute details of labor's functioning.

The bill takes the heart out of the existing five unfair labor practices of employers and leaves standing mere words.

It imposes upon unions 13 unfair labor practices and a host of unlawful concerted activities.

The theme of the bill is regulate labor but hands off the employer.

Every portion of the bill reveals a shocking one-sidedness.

Section 2 (11) (vi) (b) of title I gives the union 5 days to inform the employees of the issues in a dispute. Subsection (vi) (d) gives the employer a "reasonable time" to inform the employees of the issues in a dispute.

The bill in section 2 (11) (b) (vi) (e) provides for a secret ballot before employees may strike. Strangely enough, no provision is made for a secret ballot among stockholders to determine under what circumstances management may change its labor relations policy or fix wages.

The bill proposes that a secret ballot be taken for the employees' approval of the employer's last offer of settlement.

No provision is made for a ballot among stockholders to determine whether the union's last offer of settlement is satisfactory.

Sections 2 (14), 2 (15), 2 (16), 2 (17) of title I of the bill contain definitions of alleged illegal concerted activities by labor organizations. These include boycotts and so-called monopolistic strikes. Yet no attempt is made in the bill to impose comparable punishments upon employers who jointly agree on wage terms or other labor policies through employer associations.

Section 7 (b) of title I of the bill insists that members of labor organizations be free of unreasonable or discriminatory financial demands but no suggestion is made that stockholders in corporations be free of similar demands on the part of corporate management.

Sections 8 (b) and 8 (c) of title I of the bill contain elaborate provisions regulating the internal affairs of labor organizations. No comparable provisions are present there or anywhere else in the bill regulating the internal affairs of corporations.

Section 9 (f) (1) of title I of the bill prohibits a representative from acting as a representative of the employees of competing employers—yet nothing in the bill prevents competing employers from establishing a common labor relations policy.

The same section of the bill prohibits an international union from approving or guiding the labor relations of affiliated locals. There is not a word in the bill to condemn the frequent control over labor relations policies of member companies by employer associations.

Employer associations have written the blackest pages in our antilabor history. Under this bill they may continue to destroy unions. Unions are forced to remain helpless in the face of this attack.

A further instance of the gross bias of this legislation is section 9 (f) (2) of title I which authorizes the Board to exclude from bargaining any group whatsoever within a proposed bargaining unit if those individuals indicate a desire to be excluded from bargaining.

However, under section 9 (f) (3) the fact that employees desire to bargain and have organized for bargaining is expressly declared to be an invalid ground for grouping them in a bargaining unit.

Under section 9 (f) (7) of title I the bill prohibits more than one election within a 12-month period if the purpose of the election is to select a bargaining agent.

However, if the purpose of the election is to repudiate or decertify a bargaining agent the Board under section 9 (c) (2) is required to hold an election as often as a petition is presented.

Under section 10 (c) of title I the Board is authorized to deprive a union of its rights under the act for a year. This is equivalent in the case of a union to forcing a union to go out of business for a year.

In the case of an individual employee who violates the act, it means that the employee may be blacklisted in an entire industry for a year, since he has no rights under the act. No comparable sanctions are provided against employers who violate the act. They continue to be, as today, merely subject to cease-and-desist orders.

Likewise under section 10 (c) of title I, a special evidentiary test must be met before the Board may order the reinstatement of a discharged union member. No such procedural tenderness is shown for unions against which the Board may issue orders under the new bill.

Section 12 of title I of the bill contains a long list of so-called unlawful concerted activities by employees and unions.

The bill makes possible ex parte injunctions without hearings. Violations also mandatorily deprive unions and individuals of their rights under the act.

This means that an employer may discharge an employee who violates the act with immunity. That employee may be subject to a loss of rights for a year and be blacklisted throughout an entire industry. If a union engages in these practices, not only may it be enjoined but it may lose its right to exist for a year.

The ex parte injunction is not made available against employers. They still receive a hearing, and if the Board ultimately finds that they have violated the act, they are subject only to a cease-and-desist order.

In the sections of the bill dealing with strikes imperiling public health and safety—title II, section 203—injunctions are imposed upon unions who engage in a strike or threat of strike. This means that an employer may cut wages and nevertheless be certain that the employees will work on his terms.

No provision in the bill imposes any restraint whatsoever upon the employer.

Section 204 of title II provides for the taking of a secret ballot among employees to determine after the injunction has been outstanding 30 days whether, first, they desire to accept their employer's last offer; and, second, they desire to change their bargaining representative.

No provision is made in the bill to conduct a ballot among the stockholders to determine whether they will accept the union's last offer and whether they desire a new set of officers to embody their acceptance in a contract with the union.

Section 203 (d) of title II provides after a further delaying process for a second ballot upon the two questions indicated above.

No provision is made for comparable ballots to be taken among employer representatives.

Under title III, section 301, all of the unlawful concerted activities described in section 12 of title I of the bill—such as picketing an employer's business in large groups or picketing his home under any circumstances, engaging in sympathy strikes or a strike for recognition—are made the subject of antitrust laws, although they manifestly have nothing to do with restraints on trade.

The enormous growth of monopoly which is primarily responsible for current labor unrest is left completely untouched.

In addition, these practices are the subject of—

(a) Injunctions, ex parte, and without a hearing;

(b) Treble damages;

(c) Criminal prosecution;

(d) Unions engaging in them lose their rights under the act. In contrast to these savage penalties, an employer is subject only to a remedial order and not to punishment. He must cease and desist from the conduct which the bill prohibits.

These are only a few of the many jokers in a bill, which must mark some sort of record in one-sidedness.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, the lifeblood of a democracy is the freedom of its labor. When we have broken up the unions and dispersed the workingmen, it will be too late to ask what has become of our national vigor. History teaches us that suppression of the labor unions is the first sure step toward total dictatorship and national decay.

This Nation has not chosen that road. Twelve years ago, when Europe was already on the way to ruin, we gave new statutory recognition to the rights which American labor had won. In the National Labor Relations Act we declared it to be the policy of the United States to encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and to protect employees in the right to organize and bargain collectively. We also recognized the right to strike, without which there could be no bargaining. This law was democratic in the truest sense, for collective bargaining gives employees a voice in fixing the

conditions under which they work. It came, in time, to be called labor's Magna Carta.

The bill before the House—I refer to the committee bill, H. R. 3020—effectively repeals that Magna Carta. It weakens Federal protection against employer interference; it outlaws strikes; it penalizes unions; it meddles in their internal affairs; it subjects them to nuisance regulation; and it renders collective bargaining a mockery.

It also tosses out the National Labor Relations Board, which has done a good job under the most trying conditions, substitutes a dual bureaucratic system, multiplies delay, and assures unlimited court litigation.

It does all these things in the name of protecting the rights of employers, employees, and their representatives. But I have studied the declaration of policy contained in this bill; it carefully avoids the term "collective bargaining"; indeed, the bill repeals all reference to that term in the preamble to the existing law. Collective bargaining has been the touchstone for reconciling right with might—for enabling workers to meet with something approaching equality the economic power of great employers. Is it our purpose to revive the "yellow-dog contract"? To re-create the situation in which employees, powerless to meet their employer on terms of economic equality, are also powerless to associate collectively for dealing with him? Is it our purpose to recall conditions of fear and insecurity, in which the worker joins a union at the risk of discharge, and starts a union at the risk of blacklisting?

I have read this bill and I have read the decisions of the present Board and of the courts touching on collective bargaining, and I say to the Committee that this bill destroys collective bargaining.

The courts have said that the obligation to bargain collectively shall be discharged by good faith efforts to reach agreement. This is the very heart of the Wagner Act, to the end that industrial disputes shall have the best chance to be settled reasonably, democratically, peacefully. Every provision in the existing law is devised to advance that purpose.

What does the committee bill do about collective bargaining? First, it defines collective bargaining. For good faith bargaining, it substitutes a time table, and a mechanical routine. It says the parties shall discuss any proposal at least five times within 30 days.

That is all they have to do. The obligation to bargain in good faith is abolished.

Although the submission of counter-proposals is one of the surest evidences of good faith, the bill expressly states that this is not a requirement. This bill is satisfied if a proposal is discussed. Another indication of good faith is a willingness, within reason, to negotiate all elements of the dispute between the parties—all the issues bearing upon the employer-employee relationship. But no, this bill creates five limited categories, and provides that nothing else need even be discussed. As I read the section—at page 9—it is possible that parties to wage discussions may even refuse to discuss such universally used criteria as cost of living and wage-price relationships. Whatever may be its ultimate legal significance, I believe that this bill encourages such a refusal.

Another indication of good faith in bargaining, and one of which employers and unions often avail themselves, is the willingness to consider changes in existing agreements. They need not yield, but often, by discussion, mutual advantage may be found, understanding achieved, crises on both sides of the table averted. This bill makes clear that this shall not be required—it provokes the parties to an adamant position—encourages them to stand pat—to demand their pound of flesh.

Two specific matters which have been the subject of much collective bargaining in the past, and which have become parts of numerous collective agreements, are simply outlawed by the bill. Thus—section 8 (a) (2) (C), page 20—it becomes an unfair labor practice to grant a check off—unless it be voluntary and revocable at will—or to grant a welfare fund. Manifestly labor organizations which achieve these concessions through bargaining are not necessarily corrupted thereby.

What is the sense or the justice of requiring parties who have achieved these arrangements in good faith to alter them to their mutual inconvenience simply because of the irritation engendered by the coal strike?

Even what is left of collective bargaining under this bill is so hedged about, encumbered, and restricted by delay and red tape, and by regulations and litigation as to destroy any practical benefits either to employers or employees.

Let us consider some more definitions. "Employer" in the existing law is defined to include "any person acting in the interest of an employer." The bill—section 2 (2)—would substitute "any person acting as an agent of an employer." If these two expressions mean the same thing there is no reason for the change. The danger in the substitution is that it may result in endless litigation to test whether superintendents, foremen, supervisors, and the like whom the courts have held as "employers" under present law, qualify as "agents" under the language of the bill. Twelve years of judicial interpretation are thus set at naught.

"Employer," for the first time, excludes charitable and educational organizations. While the number of workers thus deprived of any participation in the terms of their employment may not be large, it seems ironical that organizations devoted to the social welfare should be exempted from bargaining with their own often underpaid employees.

In its zeal to exclude supervisors from employee status and protection, the bill—section 2 (12)—goes much too far. The definition not only excludes all foremen and higher supervisory employees; not only debars supervisors in the printing and maritime industries where they have traditionally bargained for decades, but removes from the protection of the act thousands of white-collar employees, pay-roll clerks, inspectors, watchmen, lead men, timekeepers, and typists. The definition of "supervisors" is so inclusive that an employer is able to make almost any worker a "supervisor" and thus exclude him from the status of an "employee." Such excluded workers will not only be powerless to bargain, they will also be without protection against discharge for union membership. If they desire to organize against the employer's will their only weapons will be to resort to the strike, the very result which the Wagner Act was intended to avert.

Section 8 (5) of the present law requires employers to bargain collectively with the representatives of their employees. The committee bill—section 8 (a) (5), page 21—imposes this obligation only with relation to currently recognized, or certified representatives.

Since it is within the power of an employer, at any time, to cease currently recognizing a union, this provision actually limits the obligation to bargain to situations in which the union has been certified by the Board. In so doing, it excuses employers from their present obligation to bargain with unions whose majority status is known and unquestioned.

If the Board were in the position to settle representation questions promptly, this requirement might not work undue hardship. But the provision must be read in connection with other provisions of the bill, which will not only delay the final certification of a representative, but leave its status, once established, subject to challenge at all times.

For example, under present law a Board certification cannot be appealed directly to a court. The employer may test the certification by refusing to bargain. If the Board issues a bargaining order, he may then obtain court review of the certification by appealing the Board's order.

The committee bill—section 10 (f), page 39—changes this rule. It makes certifications directly reviewable in court at the instance of any person aggrieved.

This provision of the bill, alone, is calculated to render collective bargaining a practical impossibility in the presence of any determined opposition, whether by a rival union, a minority group, or an employer. Here is why: The Board normally accords a certification validity immune from challenge for about a year. A year is also the average length of time necessary to complete court review of a certification. Thus the election upon which the certification was originally based will be pretty stale evidence of majority by the time the certification is sustained in court. And nothing in the bill will prevent an employer thereafter from refusing to bargain collectively, appealing from the Board's order, and testing the identical issues—of appropriate unit and majority—again.

This endlessly delays the beginning of collective bargaining and leaves unions with little incentive for submitting representation questions to the Board. It also encourages obstructive and dilatory objections by rival unions seeking delay.

Even after the certificate has been secured, and has been honored or sustained by a court this bill enables further frustration of bargaining.

Under present law, as I have said, a certification is presumed to be valid for a reasonable period of time—normally a year. This bill—section 9 (c) (2), p. 28—permits employees aggregating 30 percent in number of a unit they claim is appropriate, at any time to file application to decertify a certified representative; or to disestablish a recognized (but uncertified) representative. The Board is required to investigate and act upon such an application like any other—section 9 (d), page 29.

This provision plays havoc with stability of relationships. It means that a rival or dissident group can disrupt bargaining relationships which are on the very verge of fruition, for under existing law an employer is required to refrain from contracting with representatives whose status is challenged in a proceeding of which the Board has taken cognizance. It means that majority rule shall be effective only so long as more than 70 percent of the employees adhere to their choice. It means that a minority can force a situation in which a contract with the employer will be left without anyone to administer its grievance and arbitration provisions on the employee side. It means that a minority of only a fractional part of an appropriate unit, by claiming that that part is appropriate, can throw into confusion the representative status of the larger group.

Section 9 (f) (7)—page 33—throws sharply into focus the remarkable bias of this bill against collective bargaining. That section prohibits an election in any unit or subdivision thereof in which a valid election has been held within the preceding 12 months. A sole exception is made in the case of an application to decertify a union, which I have just discussed. Consider the result—the greatest confusion and uncertainty if the employees have selected a bargaining representative, but absolute finality for 12 months if they have not.

I turn next to the infringements which this bill makes upon the rights of employers and employees to determine the boundaries of the appropriate bargaining unit best suited to their needs. Section 9 (f) (1)—page 30—makes provision against so-called industry-wide bargaining. It states that no representative may be designated or act for employees of two or more competing employers unless their plants are less than 50 miles apart or their employees regularly aggregate less than 100. It also forbids affiliated or federated unions from bargaining or acting in concert if such activities are directly or indirectly subject to common control or approval.

This provision will break up satisfactory collective relationships which have been in existence for years. Several million workers have been bargaining with several thousand employers' associations under highly stabilized contractual arrangements. I think all must agree that this bill would again make peaceable, law-abiding employees and employers suffer because of the coal strike in which they had no part.

In addition, this provision would create thousands of new cases for the already overburdened Board since parties will not be able to continue their satisfactory arrangements and must seek new certifications upon the basis of bargaining units to be determined afresh. Raiding unions will profit from the confusion, but the parties themselves will reap nothing but chaos.

Further restrictions on employee grouping are found in section 9 (f) (2)—page 31 of the bill—which requires that upon application by "any interested person or persons" provision shall be made for a separate ballot "for any craft, department, plant, trade, calling, profession, or other distinguishable group" and that such group shall be excluded from the unit unless a majority votes for the union to be certified. This provision again takes away from the Board the power to acquiesce in the bargaining arrangements to which the parties may have accommodated themselves throughout years of bargaining. Any splinter group, however small, must be separated if an "interested person" desires it, and if the group is "distinguishable." Employers of large industrial plants will be faced with the necessity of bargaining with numerous though numerically inconsequential groups, and management's problems of maintaining any semblance of order or uniformity of conditions will multiply. Unions, of course, whether craft or industrial in form, will be weakened by the right of any splinter group to separate at will, and the total effectiveness of collective bargaining will necessarily be impaired.

Finally, the bill—section 9 (f) (6)—provides that no labor organization may be certified if one or more of its national, international, or local officers is or can reasonably be regarded as a Communist. In the absence of any criminal statute making it illegal to be a Communist, and in the absence of any precise tests as to what shall constitute reasonable grounds for belief (and by whom), this provision seems better calculated to evoke slander, recriminations, and confusion, than to approach a solution of the Communist problem.

In another section—8 (d) (3), page 26—the bill revives the right of an employer—long outlawed under existing law—to get him a company union for the purpose of bucking legitimate self-organization.

The bill states that it shall not be an unfair labor practice for an employer to form or maintain a committee of employees and to discuss with it matters of mutual interest, including grievances, wages, hours of employment, and other working conditions unless the Board has certified or the employer has recognized a representative.

Consistently since the inception of the present law both the Board and the courts have found this kind of arrangement to be an illegal interference with the rights of employees to bargain through representatives of their own choosing—to be in violation of the prohibition against dominating labor organizations.

Even under the present bill—section 2 (5), page 5—such an employer-sponsored committee is defined as a labor organization, since employees participate in it, and since it exists for the purpose of dealing with the employer concerning wages and other conditions of employment.

The proposal is an outright repeal of one of the most important provisions of existing law. It permits an employer to erect a self-inspired bulwark between himself and legitimate self-organization of his employees. Its enactment would be a blow to labor's rights and would inevitably increase labor disputes.

I turn to the provisions of the bill dealing with union security—section 8 (d) (4), page 26. Under existing law an employer may make an agreement embodying union-security provisions with any bona fide majority union.

The bill outlaws the closed shop altogether, and permits modified forms of maintenance of membership and union-shop provisions only under specified conditions—section 9 (g), page 33. First, the union must be certified by the Board; then, it must appear that the employer agreed to the union-security provisions without strike or threat of strike; then a second election must be held at which a majority of all in the unit must vote in favor of the provision. If they so vote, the provision may be agreed to, but for not longer than 2 years or the duration of the agreement, whichever is shorter. And finally no discharges may be made under the agreement except for nonpayment of dues.

This seems an elaborate, expensive, and dishonest method of dealing with the problem. For one thing it means that those unions and employers which have enjoyed union-security relations without challenge for years must submit themselves to two elections at Government expense in order to continue these arrangements. Further, if we are to allow unions to compel discharge for no reason other than nonpayment of dues, it would seem cheaper, more consistent, and more candid to permit the mandatory check-off, which is made an unfair labor practice elsewhere in the bill, and to cut out union-security altogather. Why pretend we are letting the unions have maintenance of membership and union shop? Unions are accustomed to determining for themselves the conditions of membership. The National War Labor Board recognized this. Its standard maintenance of membership clause allowed the union to insist upon "membership in good standing" as a condition of employment. This bill pretends to allow a requirement of membership but really allows only a requirement that dues be paid. Why do not they say what they mean?

Section 8 (c) of the bill, page 22, sets up 10 unfair labor practices by unions. A few of these seem harmless, but if you read all 10 you know that the bill wants us to go into the business of running the unions from Washington. We regulate dues and contributions, police the disciplining of members, prescribe for what offenses they may be expelled without a hearing, and lay down the accounting obligations of the union toward its members. This bill establishes the makings of a labor front. The American people will never accept its provisions.

In my remaining time I shall comment on the most vindictive aspects of this bill—those which outlaw strikes and penalize employees and unions.

First, any striker loses his employee status as soon as he has been permanently replaced—section 2 (3), page 4—and an employer may thus promptly rid himself of all strikers, regardless of the cause of the strike or who provoked it, by permanently replacing them.

Second, employees may be found guilty of unfair labor practices—section 8 (b), page 21—such as "intimidation," refusal to bargain, and participation in economic strikes for objectives not expressly authorized by the bill. Workers will have to be pretty good lawyers—for the authorized objectives of bargaining in this bill are new and ambiguous and have not been judicially construed.

The penalty for engaging in one of these new employee-unfair-labor practices is loss of rights under the act which means, of course, loss of job.

I have already mentioned the catalog of unfair-labor practices by unions. Any union found to have committed one would lose the rights, if any may be found, which still belong to unions under this bill.

But these are mild provisions. Section 12, page 47, creates a long list of unlawful concerted activities and provides most drastic penalties. Not only is the use of force and violence prohibited, but also three different kinds of picketing; nine specified kinds of strikes are outlawed, the sympathy strike, jurisdictional strike, monopolistic strike, illegal boycott, sit-down strike, featherbedding strike, strike for recognition, strike to compel violation of law, and lastly, I quote:

> Any strike * * * to remedy practices for which an administrative remedy is available under this act.

In other words, the greater the employer's provocation, the more certain is a strike to be illegal, for if the employer engages in really serious unfair labor practices, a strike in protest becomes one to remedy practices for which administrative remedies exist.

Actually, under this bill no strike is legal unless, after exhaustion of collective bargaining and after the employer has been given a reasonable time to argue directly to the employees the virtues of his last offer, and after a Government-conducted poll, a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit vote to reject that offer and to strike.

And by that time, even if the employees want to stick with their union and do go on strike, they may immediately be replaced. If that happens, they are no longer employees. To the extent they try to bargain thereafter, their strike has become illegal, since it seeks recognition.

These provisions encourage employers to undercut and toss out unions, encourage employers to provoke employees, so that a single misstep will cost them their economic freedom. They constitute an intolerable regimentation of American labor.

If an employer succeeds in provoking a violation of section 12 by employees or a union in a sheer struggle to survive, they not only lose their rights under the act, but become liable for treble damages under the Sherman antitrust laws and lose the immunity accorded by the Norris-LaGuardia Act against ex parte injunctions.

This means that any strike may be enjoined by court order without a hearing.

Most of the real abuses which the bill proposes to penalize are already violations of State law, to which violators are subject. On the other hand, employer violations of labor's rights can be reached only through the procedures of the Wagner Act. What is the fairness in now subjecting workers to dual prosecution?

An employer who violates the Wagner Act is afforded a full hearing. If a Board order is issued, he may appeal it through the courts. Then and only then must he cease and desist, and take remedial action if so ordered. This may take years.

Under this one-sided bill, an employee who falls afoul of section 12 loses his job, may be immediately enjoined without a hearing, may be blacklisted for a year, and is subject to treble damages.

Will such discrimination stand the test of conscience? I think not.

The strikes and stoppages which have provoked this bitter bill are symptoms of our country's growth, of its adaptation to world-shaking dislocations. These problems are not to be solved by shutting our eyes to the fact that 15,000,000 of our people are organized in unions, or to the reasons for which they joined, nor by provoking class struggle. What is needed is cool heads and calm study. No honor will accrue to this House if we approve the vindictive crucifixion of American labor, offer our working people second-class citizenship, subvert their hard-won social and economic gains—the fruit of a century of struggle, require honorable employers to withdraw freely negotiated benefits or destroy stable and satisfactory relationships, or provoke less honorable employers to union busting and labor baiting.

I trust that the membership will reject this bill.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I have written a speech on this proposed legislation and have obtained permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My remarks are directed to the men and women who comprise the rank and file of labor and I intend to see that my speech reaches them. Therefore, I see no reason for taking up the time of the Members of this committee listening to my remarks which are primarily intended for someone else. Any Member who is interested in my remarks may read them in the RECORD. However, there is no compulsion to read them as there would be to listen to them if I spoke further at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I insert at this point in the RECORD an amendment which I shall propose at the appropriate time so that the Members may have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with it before it comes up for consideration. This amendment proposes to relieve the people of the fear of national paralysis due to labor strife and in this way to enable us to deal constructively with labor free of the pressure of this legitimate public fear.

Page 57, line 10, to page 58, line 21, strike out the text of section 203 and substitute the following:

"SEC. 203. Whenever the President finds after investigation and proclaims that a labor dispute has resulted in, or imminently threatens to result in, the cessation or substantial curtailment of interstate or foreign commerce in an industry essential to the public health or security, of sufficient magnitude to imperil or imminently threaten to imperil the public health or security, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to preserve and protect the public health or security, the President is authorized to declare a national emergency relative thereto, and by order to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or facility, the subject of such labor dispute, and to use and to operate such plant, mine, or facility in the interests of the United States: *Provided, however,* That (1) such plant, mine, or facility while in the possession of the United States and while operated in its interests, shall be operated only to the minimum extent which seems to the President necessary to protect the public health or security of the United States, or of any material part of the territory or population thereof; and (2) the wages and other terms of employment in the plant, mine, or facility so taken, during the period of Government possession and operation shall be as prescribed by the President pursuant to the applicable provisions of law, and to the findings of a panel or commission specially designated or appointed for the purpose by the President, which wages and other terms of employment shall be not less than those prevailing for similar work in the area of such plant, mine, or facility by private business; and (3) such plant, mine, or facility shall be returned to the employer as soon as practicable, but in no event later than 30 days after the restoration of such labor relations in such plant, mine, or facility, that the possession and operation thereof by the United States, or in its interests, is no longer necessary to insure the minimum operation thereof required for the protection and preservation of the public health or security; and (4) the President may by order confer authority upon any Government department or officer to take possession of, to operate, or to exercise any other of the powers herein granted to the President with respect to any such plant, mine, or facility; and (5) fair and just compensation shall be paid to the employer for the period of such possession and operation by the United States, or in its interests, as follows:

"(A) The President shall determine the amount of the compensation to be paid as rental for the use of such plant, mine, or facility while in the possession of or operated by the United States, or in its interests, such determination to be made as of the time of the taking hereunder.

"(B) If the employer is unwilling to accept as a fair and just compensation for the use of the property taken hereunder by the United States and as full and complete compensation therefor, the amount so determined by the President, the employer shall be paid 50 percent of such amount and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any District Court of

the United States in the manner provided by sections 24 (20) and 145 of the Judicial Code (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 41 and 250) for an additional amount which when added to the amount so paid shall be equal to the total sum which the employer considers to be fair and just compensation for the use of the property so taken by the United States."

If the foregoing amendment is adopted I shall offer the following additional amendments to the next section of the bill:

Page 58, line 22, strike out all following: "(a)" up to the word "it" in line 25 and insert the following:

"Whenever the President has issued an order under section 203 by virtue of a labor dispute which imperils, or imminently threatens to imperil, the public health or security."

Page 62, line 2, after the word "order", strike out the next four words up to the word "issued" in line 3.

Page 62, lines 4 to 8 inclusive, strike out subsection (f) of section 204.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an amendment which he expects to offer to the pending bill.)

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, a bill of rights for the American workman and the American people. That, Mr. Chairman, is the simplest description of this measure now under consideration.

H. R. 3020 restores to Americans, workmen and employers alike, the rights guaranteed them by the Constitution. It ends super-government by labor czars. It ends immunity from law for labor bosses. It ends the power of a labor dictator, by a nod of his head, to strangle the economy of our Nation of 130,000,000 people. It ends the authority of a labor racketeer to deny a workman the right to earn a living for himself and his family. And it does these things, Mr. Chairman, without sacrifice of a single legitimate union activity. This bill is antiabuse, not antilabor. It is a bill which, at last, puts the interest of John Q. Public above the interest of John L. Lewis. It is a bill which is for the American workman and against the dictators who have so effectively enslaved him.

I happen to be the only industrialist on the majority side of the Committee on Education and Labor. I have always regarded myself as a conservative. In each of my three elections, I have campaigned on that basis. Yet in the formulation of this bill in committee, I have found myself repeatedly on the liberal side. I would not support this bill, as I do, did I believe it to be contrary to labor's best interests, or damaging to the legitimate labor union movement.

It was abuses by a few selfish corporations which made necessary, in the public interest, the corrective measures of a few decades ago applicable alike to good and bad corporations. It is abuses by a few reckless drivers which make necessary, in the public interest, the speed laws applicable alike to careless and careful drivers. It is abuses by criminal elements which make necessary, in the public interest, laws regulating use of firearms applicable alike to peaceful and dangerous citizens. It is abuses in labor unions which make necessary, in the public interest, the law we are now considering and which is applicable alike to well run and badly run labor unions.

It will be my purpose, in the remainder of this address, to cite some of these principal labor union abuses and point out the manner by which this bill will protect the American public and the American workingman against such abuses.

A certain labor leader has been president of a monopolistic union for a couple of decades. Under the terms of the union's laws—and note that they are commonly termed laws although they have been enacted by no legislative body yet do exercise absolute control over the economic life of union members—this man can never be ousted as president for the simple reason that anyone advocating his ouster can be thrown out of the union on the charge of advocating a dual union. This union controls some 95 percent of the output of a commodity essential to the Nation's production and health. At a spoken word from this president, the 400,000 members of his union lay down their tools and cease work. They do not resume work until he has spoken again. And until he has spoken again, tens of millions of American workmen are prevented from working. He achieves his power through industry-wide bargaining. This man is John L. Lewis and his union is the United Mine Workers of America.

The bill before you strips John L. Lewis of his dictatorial powers. It prohibits industry-wide bargaining by restricting bargaining, with a minor exception, to the single-employer level. It prohibits any strike until a majority of all the workmen affected have had opportunity by secret ballot to express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their employer's last offer.

A certain man had devoted his life to the education of children in a particular field. He achieved phenomenal success. But, in doing so, he incurred the displeasure of the czaristic president of a certain union. Without proper trial and at the mere whim of the union president, this man was deprived of his union card. Thereafter, no children under his direction could perform over the radio nor could he lead them in any theater. He was even denied use of certain school buildings. His name is Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, the founder of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Michigan. The union is, of course, the musicians' union whose president is James Caesar Petrillo. The musicians' union is a closed shop.

The bill before you abolishes the closed shop. No longer will James Caesar Petrillo, under this bill, have power to deny Dr. Maddy his right to lead his orchestras of young people in radio or theater or school performances.

A certain jobber and commission merchant had worked in the business of distributing produce since he was 7 years old. A racketeering union had demanded that he join their union and that his firm sign the most iniquitous contract of which the Committee on Education and Labor heard in some 2,000,000 words of testimony. He and his firm refused. Thereupon, he was told by the boss of the union that he had 15 minutes to leave the area in which his business was located. If he failed to get out and stay out, the union boss informed him that he, a partner in the business, would be beaten up. This man is Herman J. Chassen, a jobber and commission merchant in the Dock Street Market of Philadelphia. The union is local 929 of the teamsters' union, A. F. of L. The union racketeer who told Mr. Chassen to leave the area of his place of business or else be beaten up is Turk Daniels, the president of the union.

Under H. R. 3020, Mr. Chassen could not only apply to the court for injunctive protection to his person, the Norris-LaGuardia Act notwithstanding, but he could also sue the teamsters' union for the damages the union's unlawful activity had caused him.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America guarantees the right of free speech to all Americans. Yet, the National Labor Relations Board, over a period of 7 years, denied that right to an American who happened to be an employer. If the union representing, or seeking to represent his employees published barefaced lies with regard to the employer and if the employer even attempted to answer those lies, his answer would be an unfair labor practice as per the 7-year interpretations of the National Labor Relations Board.

The bill before you abolishes the National Labor Relations Board. The Committee on Education and Labor in writing this bill did not feel that a Government board which denied to Americans a right guaranteed by the Constitution is entitled to continued existence.

A certain canning factory in California maintained harmonious relations with its employees. No disputes existed. Both AFL and CIO moved in and demanded that the employer sign a closed-shop contract requiring that all employees take membership in their particular union. AFL contended that, if the employer refused an AFL contract, the AFL teamsters union would transport neither the company's incoming raw material nor the company's outgoing finished product. CIO, on the other hand, informed the company that unless all employees joined CIO, the factory would receive no supply of tin cans because CIO controlled the factory in which the cans were produced.

H. R. 3020 outlaws the secondary boycott. Under its terms, employers and employees can no longer be caught in the middle between rival and grasping labor unions.

In California, a small firm manufactured paint with the assistance of three employees. A union agent appeared demanding that the employer sign a closed-shop contract forcing these three employees to join the union or be fired. These employees were satisfied with their wages and conditions of employment, did not wish to join the union, and the employer on their behalf refused to execute the contract. Thereupon, the plant

was picketed and all teamsters in the vicinity were forbidden to haul raw materials or finished products. Faced with no alternative, the employer then signed the contract and each employee paid $75 initiation fee. Three weeks later, the Oakland general strike was called. Despite the fact that the contract contained a no-strike clause, these three employees were ordered out on strike. They lost their pay while the strike continued but there was no relaxation in the requirement that they continue to pay their union dues.

The bill before you requires that there be a dispute between employer and employee before picketing can ruin the business and force employees to pay tribute to racketeers.

It is obvious that conciliators and mediators, to perform most effectively in a dispute between employees and employers, must be unbiased. Yet, under existing law, the United States Conciliation Service is a function of the Department of Labor, which Department, under the organic statute by which it was established, is bound to be biased in favor of labor. The Secretary of Labor, in his testimony before the committee, denied bias on the part of the Conciliation Service. He denied this bias despite the fact that bias is required of the Secretary of Labor, who, in turn, is the boss of the Conciliation Service.

The Committee on Education and Labor believes that conciliation and mediation can be most effective without bias—hence the independent Conciliation Service established under this bill.

In New York City, a butter, egg, and cheese business was founded in 1898 with four employees. Over the years, the number of employees grew to 82, who, through profit-sharing and enlightened treatment, are well paid, loyal, and happy. Their rates of pay and working conditions are substantially superior to the union scale which prevails in the city. Hence, these employees were nonreceptive to joining the union. The union; however, demanded tribute. Failing to get it, boycott was applied to the trucks, the piers, the warehouses, even the customers with which the firm does business. Farmers who customarily sold their produce to this firm were fearful for their lives and property were they to attempt to drive their trucks to the firm's place of business. The firm has been compelled to meet the situation by driving its own trucks 20 or 30 miles from the city for clandestine meetings with the farmers' trucks on remote country roads. And this, Mr. Chairman, is in America.

H. R. 3020 reestablishes for American workmen and American business the right, peacefully, to earn their livelihoods without first squaring matters with union gangsters.

Another produce merchant—this time in Philadelphia—suffered a complete cessation of his business because of his refusal to sign a contract with a hoodlum-dominated union, which, under the terms of the contract, would have required him to obtain permission from the union before he could even visit his place of business on Saturday.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, substitutes protection guaranteed by law for protection guaranteed by thugs at a price.

The abuses I have recited are not typical of labor unions in America. Neither are blackmail, extortion, intimidation, and physical violence typical of the American citizen. But, because there are criminals who practice blackmail, extortion, intimidation, and physical violence, we have laws to protect the public against such practices. H. R. 3020 is to protect American workmen and the American people against the abuses which have developed in a small segment of the labor-union movement.

The bill deserves the support of every right-thinking American.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the majority of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House has prepared a bill, H. R. 3020, which it offers as a means of assuring industrial peace. The majority pleads for the adoption of this bill on the ground that it will strengthen democracy and the free-enterprise system. It asserts that this bill was written as the majority's "response to the mandate that the people of the United States gave us last November."

This, the so-called Labor-Management Relations Act, is not a product of a democratic process. The full committee did not have the opportunity to participate in its preparation. It was written in secrecy, behind closed doors. The proposals which it contains were not subjected to a test of public hearings. The minority members of the committee received copies of the bill on April 10 and were told to have the minority report available by April 12. No room was afforded for committee deliberation, interchange of views, or debate. The bill was jammed through the committee by the strong-arm tactics repugnant to the very process of democracy.

The provisions of the bill are in direct contravention to the expression of the will of the people recorded in the last election and is an abject refusal by the majority party in power to live up to the party commitments and pledges and to the campaign promises so glibly made only 6 months ago.

The proposed measure is fraudulent in its stated objective, in its declared intent, and in the language of its specific provisions. What this bill does is, not to reduce the far-reaching Government intervention which the people called for last year but to increase that intervention sevenfold and to make private actions of businessmen, as well as of the workers, subject to drastic regimentation and control. It clothes Federal agents with almost unlimited authority, arms them with the force of drastic penalties, and gives them legal authority to invade the most intimate phases of the day-to-day relations of the employer and his employees. At a stroke of a pen, it destroys the age-long relationships painfully built up by labor and management through private contract. It writes a step-by-step itinerary which both management and labor must strictly follow at the risk of being adjudged criminals if caught in a single misstep from the rigid and narrow plank which the bill would compel them to walk.

Despite the fact that the multiple and extremely intricate provisions of the bill are far more drastic than any measure of Federal regulation ever proposed within the framework of our constitutional government, they have been written without study and without adequate consideration. The main features of the bill are not supported by evidence brought out in the hearings held by the committee. They are founded on neither fact nor even an important contention of any major responsible witness representative of the point of view of the management, the public, or of labor. Secretly concocted, the bill has been rushed before this House under limited rules with the clear intent of jamming it through with tactics reminiscent of the blitz. This most far-reaching legislative proposal, whose effect will be felt by every enterprise and every citizen of the United States, has received far less committee consideration than was given to the British loan, and will be subject to much more limited debate than any number of proposals secondary to the formation of the public policy of the United States.

The outstanding feature of this bill is the fact that it cannot be honestly claimed to be legislation which would contribute to the maintenance of industrial peace. On the contrary, its enactment is bound to set off a chain reaction of industrial unrest that is likely to shake our economy to its very foundations and jeopardize the survival of our free institutions.

Industrial unrest since the end of the war was not the result of a break-down in collective bargaining. It was not due to any shortcoming of the Wagner Act. It was not the result of any concerted or restrictive practices of labor unions. It was real and genuine unrest caused by a very real force: the squeeze between constantly rising prices and declining wage income. Every wage earner and every housewife knows what it means to be caught in this merciless vise. They know, and the Members of this House know, that the root of the trouble has been inflation. Yet H. R. 3020 refuses to go to the source of trouble. It does not deal with causes of our industrial strife. It chooses to ignore them and to hide behind a phony camouflage and a false indictment of the men and women who have suffered most from the relentless robbery of unbridled inflation.

H. R. 3020 outlaws voluntary self-organization and free collective bargaining. It turns unions into puppets of the state. I say to you that depriving workers of their right of self-organization and collective bargaining will not further industrial peace. No, on the contrary, it will breed industrial unrest. It will leave no room for the adjustment of real grievances, for the correction of real abuses in the condition of the work-

er. It answers the worker's legitimate complaint with the injunction. His plea for the correction of a true injustice, it answers with a contempt citation. For the workers it offers nothing but punishment and compulsion.

What will this royalist suppression of the workers' economic rights produce? A sense of hatred and a spirit of revolt. It will drive patriotic and law-abiding peace-loving citizens to political protest. It will make them fall an easy prey to the Communists and other subversive forces. These enemies of democracy will, in turn, seize upon this long-awaited opportunity to undermine our democratic institutions, to foster class hatred and political unrest. Yes, at the time when our free institutions stand on trial before the whole world, the adoption of this oppressive bill would make a mockery of the ideals of freedom which have become a symbol to many nations of America's purpose, her stature, and her strength. Like a smothering black cloud, this bill would snuff out the torch of liberty that has guided America in her onward and upward march of industrial progress, never matched by any nation in the history of mankind.

This bill has been offered in this Congress by the Republican majority of this House and in the name of the Republican Party. But I submit that there is real and reasonable doubt about the true origin and authorship of this proposal. It was devised and drafted in shameful secrecy which ill becomes elected public representatives responsible to the people. "Who wrote H. R. 3020?" is a pertinent and legitimate question which the people can rightly ask of its sponsors. Were the attorneys and lobbyists of giant and powerful corporate aggregates admitted behind the closed doors of the committee chambers just by accident when the bill was drawn? Was the expensive and lurid antilabor propaganda with which the Halls of Congress have been strewn in the last few days just a coincidence?

There is more than a clue in the fact that the program of labor legislation drafted by the National Association of Manufacturers last December and published in full-page advertisements in the New York Times and scores of other papers on January 8 of this year, is embodied in its entirety in the proposed bill. There is more than a hint of the bill's real origin in the fact that several sections of this NAM program are written into the bill word for word. Study this bill; examine it carefully, and you will be driven to the inevitable conclusion about its true authorship. Listen to its language and observe the open and the hidden points of its thrusts. And you will be compelled to conclude: Yes, the voice is the voice of the Republican majority, but the hand is the hand of the National Association of Manufacturers.

The employers who are giving support to these proposals are a small but powerful minority of American employers. The great majority of representative employers are not in sympathy with this drastic bill. Most employer witnesses appearing before our committee not only failed to support the key provisions of the proposal, but termed the excessive Government regulation and drastic repression of collective bargaining as dangerous and objectionable. There is a small minority of short-sighted employer spokesmen who yearn to duplicate the union-breaking tactics of their predecessors after the First World War. At that time a number of employer organizations, led by the National Association of Manufacturers, conducted a vicious anti-union campaign which resulted in a widespread union destruction and a 25-percent membership loss by labor unions within 2 years.

The sponsors of the bill contend that they are legislating industrial peace. But I defy you to find anything in its provisions that bears directly on the recent record of industrial disputes. Let us examine that record.

The winning of the war brought on the cancellation of war contracts and the reconversion of war industries. The length of the workweek was cut back, overtime was reduced, and millions of workers were down-graded into jobs of less skill and lower pay. All this meant that the individual worker's take-home pay was drastically reduced. Remember that it was the worker's take-home pay out of which came the money to feed, house, and clothe the family. As a result, workers sought increases in basic wage rates. These wage increases to offset the workers' rising living costs were vigorously resisted by employers.

Thus we had two forces working in opposite directions. The result was inevitable. Early in 1946 this country went through several months of widespread work stoppages. However, beginning with May 1946, to date work-stoppages have declined steadily. In recent months, time lost through strikes accounted for less than two one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total working time.

In reviewing this record since VJ-day, it is significant that only a few strikes have been responsible for a relatively large proportion of the total time lost from all strikes. For example, during the 1-year period following VJ-day, three strikes accounted for 46 percent, and seven strikes accounted for 61 percent of the idleness caused by strikes.

These figures give perspective to the postwar strikes. But they do not show what caused them. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has made a special study of the 29 strikes involving 10,000 or more workers which began during 1946. Of these 29 strikes the major issue in 21, accounting for over 95 percent of the total idleness, was the question of wages. In three more the major issue was a combination of wages and union security. These figures give some indication of the causes for the 1946 strikes. During the past 9 months, work stoppages have been getting fewer and the record of industrial relations has been, on the whole, quite satisfactory. Only two major disputes have occurred—in coal and the telephone industries. Nothing in the provisions of H. R. 3020 would help settle these disputes. In the 12 months prior to that, 9 out of every 10 workers who engaged in a work stoppage, did so solely to protect their income against the inroads of inflation. That basic problem can be solved only by the assurance of economic stability, and not by a modification of the Wagner Act or regimentation of unions.

It would be very fine if we could eliminate all work stoppages due to labor-management disputes. But we must remember that the only countries that have succeeded in abolishing strikes are the countries that have succeeded in abolishing freedom. Strikes and the freedom of each individual worker to reject the terms and conditions of his employment, whether singly or in concert with others, is an integral part of our democratic society. A country which compels workers to perform their task through the exercise of force or threat of punishment, cannot be called a free country. No matter how thick the disguise, it accepts involuntary servitude.

H. R. 3020 repeals the Wagner Act and instead of the National Labor Relations Board, creates a Labor-Management Relations Board and an office of the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act. The Administrator prosecutes unfair labor practices before the Board. He also acts as the agent of the Board, before which he appears as the prosecutor, in making applications to the courts for enforcement of orders of the Board. Aside from this, the Administrator is also given the quasi-judicial function of investigating representation petitions. This arrangement makes the procedure complicated and confused. Under it no employer and no union would escape the constant danger of running afoul of some requirement of the law.

The bill is claimed to "equalize" the Wagner Act. Actually it relieves the employer from any serious responsibility or obligation, while subjecting unions to a constant threat of their complete elimination. A worker or a union, found to engage in an unfair labor practice, is deprived of the right of collective bargaining. The right of forming a union is then withdrawn and the union is put out of existence for at least a year. No such penalty is, of course, placed upon the employer.

The present National Labor Relations Act does not merit any drastic amendment. Actually, the Wagner Act has been extremely successful in reducing the number and impact of strikes involving union recognition. In 1937, for example, there were 2331 strikes whose major issue was union recognition or discrimination. This constituted 50 percent of that year's total strikes. Contrast this with the figure for 1945 when there were only 601 strikes in this category, comprising only 13.2 percent of the total. The record is even better for the first year following VJ-day. The Department of Labor statistics show that union recognition was an issue in only 23 strikes involving 1,000 or more workers during that time. This represents only 5.3 percent of the total strikes, and only

4.1 percent of the total man-days idle caused by these strikes.

Another group of proposals in the bill constitutes an attempt to impose the arbitrary restrictions on the free process of collective bargaining. I am referring specifically to the anti-closed shop amendments and the proposal to ban industry-wide bargaining.

In my opinion these two proposals are the most pernicious of the entire lot. We have come a long way in the handling of labor disputes in this country, and the biggest step that we have taken is the recognition that collective bargaining and not individual bargaining is the most practical and equitable method of settling disputes between employers and employees. It is now commonly accepted that collective bargaining is the cornerstone of the relations between unions and management. It represents the means whereby a free and voluntary agreement is reached concerning terms and conditions of employment.

Since we are all agreed that the best agreement is a voluntary agreement, it is sound logic that employers and employees should, together, settle their mutual problems. Whenever these two together are able to reach a mutual understanding, they should be permitted to do so without any outside interference. There should be no Government agency dictating or prescribing the provisions or the limits of this agreement. Only if that agreement violates the constitutional rights of individuals or is directly harmful to the public welfare should Government interfere. Certainly Government should not interfere to declare that unions and management cannot enter into industry-wide agreement, or that they are prohibited from agreeing on a closed or union shop. So long as these two practices have benefited the parties directly involved who have voluntarily adopted them, there is no need for Government action of any kind.

The facts are that both industry-wide bargaining and the closed shop have been instrumental in achieving a very high degree of stability in many industries. Industry-wide bargaining has been practiced in many industries for as long as 50 or more years. In the pressed and blown glassware industries, no major strikes have occurred since the signing of a master agreement between the union and an employers' association in 1888. Among industries in which industry-wide or association-wide bargaining has become prevalent are: Men's and women's clothing, shipbuilding, pottery, trucking, construction, paper and pulp, shipping, and a number of others.

Industry and regional bargaining has been successful in achieving its basic objective, greater standardization of wages and employment conditions. This has meant greater stability for the industry, generally higher wages, and at the same time fewer bankruptcies and a higher proportion of the firms returning a fair profit. This conclusion is supported by the findings of a special study recently completed by the industrial relations section of Princeton University. This comprehensive research survey concludes:

> Under national or regional bargaining, wage decisions are likely to be more sensible and far-sighted, taking into consideration the economic interests of the industry as a whole, than is the case where the wage pattern for the industry is established by a wage leader or by local bargaining with the union playing one firm against another. Experience (e. g., west coast pulp and paper in 1940) indicates that the union's wage demands may be more modest when they apply uniformly and simultaneously to all plants in a multiple-employer unit."[1]

Through the free collective-bargaining process, unions and employers mutually determine the form of their collective agreement and fit it to the most effective way of solving the problems both confront. In many cases over the past 50 years, the scope of these agreements has been enlarged in response to the growth of large-scale enterprises and the increasing interdependence of related business enterprises. Statutory limitation of labor agreements to a single locality is a direct attack upon the process of free collective bargaining. Any such attempt to confine collective bargaining to a specific area will turn back the clock of industrial progress.

The closed shop is another issue on which there has been a great deal of misunderstanding. The anti-closed-shop amendments of H. R. 3020 in reality would destroy all types of union security, including maintenance of membership and union shop arrangements. Proponents of this restrictive legislation, whether by design or accident, have obscured the fact that their proposal would strike at approximately 74 percent of all the workers covered by collective-bargaining agreements. According to the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1945, 45 percent of all workers under agreement are employed under closed or union shop contracts, while an additional 29 percent are covered by maintenance-of-membership clauses.

The closed or union shop is necessary for constructive union-management relations. By "constructive union-management relations" is meant relations which have gone beyond the cat-and-dog or hair-pulling stage of collective bargaining. This means the development of a mutually cooperative effort to reduce labor costs, stabilize output at a high level, and improve quality. Only in this way does collective bargaining serve its real purpose of bringing benefits to our economy through higher wages, progressively lower prices, and a fair return on investment.

This type of constructive union-management relations has been worked out in many specific labor-management situations. It is only possible where the union is strong, independent, and disciplined, and is secure in the knowledge that the employer has unequivocally accepted the principle of collective bargaining. These conditions reflect a degree of union security which is only possible under a closed or union shop.

The proposed bill contains a wide range of other restrictive, prohibitive and punitive provisions. Many of them are repetitious, overlapping and almost unbelievable in their confusion and complexity. It amends the Clayton Anti-Trust Act of 1914, turning back the clock 33 years. It repeals the basic Norris-LaGuardia Act, making workers in specific situations subject to the "yellow-dog contract" and reviving the war on unions through the injunction. It revamps the Conciliation Service. And, above everything else, it creates a completely monstrous procedure whereby nine distinct agencies of the government intervene as independent agents in a labor dispute affecting public welfare. After a ride on this incredible government merry-go-round, the dispute is left just where it started.

This is dangerous, ill-conceived and ill-considered legislation. It must not be allowed to become law. Its aim is to destroy organized labor and to lead the nation down a dark and murky path of dubious political regimentation both of unions and of industrial management.

Let Congress prove itself in this test of its statesmanship. Let it initiate a careful and judicious study of labor-management relations, through a joint committee, proposed by the President in his message to this Congress last January. Let the Congress then, upon full, public and open study, formulate reasonable and effective proposals, dealing with the causes as well as the results of industrial unrest. That is the path of sanity, statesmanship and of lasting service to the people of America.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

THE REPUBLICAN SCAB LABOR BILL H. R. 3020 AND UNION SECURITY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the deep sympathy and love of the Republican Party for the working people of America is evidenced by the bill which they have brought to the floor today. I want the people of the United States to know that this bill, H. R. 3020, is a Republican bill. It was reported out by a unanimous vote of the Republican members of the Labor and Education Committee. A majority of the Democratic members voted against reporting of such a bill. The velvet covering of last November's campaign promises has been torn away. The steel claw is now in evidence for everyone to see, and that steel claw is at the throat of the working people of the United States. This omnibus labor bill, or I should say "antilabor" bill, if it should become the law of the land, will take away from the workers of America both organized and unorganized, the ability to protect themselves against predatory corporations and vicious employers, whose main interest is profits and not the welfare of the average workingman. As the debate proceeds on this bill, section by section,

[1] Wages Under National and Regional Collective Bargaining. By Richard A. Lester and Edward A. Robie. Industrial relations section, Princeton University, 1946, p. 93.

you will see exposed the real purpose of the Republican Party in its professed love for labor. You will see that H. R. 3020, the Republican scab labor bill, will unfold in all its ugliness. The measure under consideration is so comprehensive in its attack on basic rights of labor that it is impossible for any speaker to cover the bill in its entirety. I will, therefore, direct my remarks specifically to the subject of union security.

The people of America, workers, farmers, and businessmen, are tired of industrial strife. They are deeply aware of the fact that the future of this Nation and the self-interest of every citizen is not served by unions and employers slugging out their differences in economic warfare. They want stability in industrial relations. They expect us as their legislative representatives to promote that stability.

The majority of the Committee on Education and Labor proposes to promote industrial stability by H. R. 3020. That number deserves to live in the history of this Chamber as representing one of the most cynical, vindictive, and ill-begotten legislative monstrosities that it has ever produced. Instead of promoting stability in industrial relations, it stimulates friction. Instead of encouraging responsibility in union organizations and a disposition on the part of employers to bargain collectively in good faith, it is well calculated to break the national unity which won us a war, and separate us into a society of warring classes. H. R. 3020 is the kind of bill that Karl Marx might well have written for inclusion in an appendix to Das Kapital as an illustration of the type of legislation which would intensify the warfare between economic groups and classes and thereby accelerate his anticipated collapse of the free enterprise and the capitalistic system and the triumph of the one-class proletarian socialistic state.

It would take me more time than has been allotted to describe the mischief in the provisions of this bill. I shall confine myself to only one aspect—its effect on union security.

Union security is a good term in the minds of all excepting those relatively few but sometimes powerful employers who belong to the stone age of industrial relations and feel that justice, truth, and the good life will only be served by destroying every union in the country. Nothing stimulates aggression like fear; nothing promotes peace like security. That is true of private individuals, employers, nations, and even unions. One of the classic illustrations of that proposition in the labor field is the molders' union in the A. F. of L. which between 1850 and 1890 engaged in a tragic and bitter contest with the stove manufacturers, primarily over the closed-shop issue. When an agreement was finally arbitrated and the manufacturers in good faith reversed their position and accepted unionism, the union lost interest in its closed-shop demand.

The lesson is plain: The closed shop or maintenance-of-membership shop are means by which workers seek to protect their organizations from the attacks of the stone-age employers. They are not ends in themselves. They are shields against employer aggression and intimidation. Labor history shows that when employers seek to destroy unions, the demand for union security becomes more insistent; when employers in particular industries accept unionization, the closed union or maintenance-of-membership shop is a piece of useless armor to which no one pays any attention. It is obvious, therefore, that the sense of security which comes from collective-agreement provisions of that character is a definite contribution to industrial peace.

For the benefit of those who may be confused by these terms, permit me to define them briefly. A closed shop, generally, is one in which an employer may hire only union members who must remain in good membership standing, in default of which they will be discharged; a union shop is one in which nonunion employees may be hired, but they must join the union within a definite period of time; in a maintenance-of-membership shop no worker is obliged to join a union, but if he does he must remain in good standing for the life of the collective agreement.

Under existing law all of these types of shops are legal excepting in some few States in which hysterical legislatures, reckless of constitutional consequences, have banned the closed shop. Section 8 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, in a proviso added to the provision making it an unfair labor practice for an employer, by discrimination, to encourage or discourage membership in a union, specifically permits employers to enter into collective agreements for a closed shop with a majority of the employees in the bargaining unit. That act, then, does nothing to facilitate closed-shop agreements or to make them legal in any State where they are declared illegal. It merely leaves it up to the parties to agree, if they so desire, upon that degree of union security which they deem appropriate.

Before pointing out the effect of H. R. 3020 on the status quo, I wish to make this observation. I do not wish to be understood as an unqualified defender of closed shops or more moderate types of union security. There is evidence that undemocratic practices have crept into some unions, and their union-security status has been abused. We should legislate to correct those abuses, not destroy union security. However the majority of the committee may feel, I do not favor amputation of an arm as a cure for an infected finger.

The committee was informed by the Secretary of Labor that as of last April of the 77 percent of all employees in unions working under some form of union security, 30 percent were under closed-shop contracts, 15 percent under union-shop contracts, 29 percent under maintenance-of-membership contracts, and 3 percent under preferential-hiring contracts—another form of union security provision.

Now let us examine the contribution of the majority of the committee to industrial discord and warfare.

First, in section 8 (a) (3) of the bill—page 21 of the print—it drops the proviso from the National Labor Relations Act which permitted employers to enter into closed-shop agreements without fear of being accused of an unfair labor practice. Then, in section 8 (d) (4)—pages 26 and 27 of the print—it proceeds to state what shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice. That provision permits employers to enter into agreements with certified unions for a union shop or a maintenance-of-membership shop. It does not permit employers or unions to enter into a closed shop. In consequence, if the bill should pass, the employers who have 30 percent of all union workers under existing contracts providing for a closed shop, can immediately be charged with unfair labor practices because, in the language of 8 (a) (3), by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment they are encouraging membership in a labor organization. Many of these contracts have a year or more to run. They were the product of honest bargaining. The workers have fought hard and long for their union security, and have sacrificed wage increases and other benefits for them. I fear that I have no words to characterize the committee proposal. That it is an arrant disregard of the solemn obligation of contract and fair dealing is obvious—but it is equally plain that in addition to depriving many employers of an institution that for many years has afforded them relative industrial peace and stability, it will outrage the sense of justice of workers who presently are protected by closed-shop contracts. The committee wants to outlaw agreements affecting millions of workers which were legal when made and were intended to bind the parties for some period in the future. The legislative methods it suggests that this Congress approve are reprehensible. I do not even want to discuss the legality of those methods under the Constitution.

I have already indicated that section 8 (d) (4) permits union and maintenance of membership shops. But let us examine the obstacles placed in the path of agreement on these types of union security which make a sham of the legislative permission.

In the first place, the union shop and maintenance of membership shop contract can only be entered into by an employer if the provisions are not in conflict with State law. Thus, the committee turns back to the discredited thinking underlying the Articles of Confederation and closes its eyes to what every informed adult knows—that the industrial strength of this Nation flows over State lines, and that when local diversity of control constitutes a burden on that interstate flow and effort, it must give way to central control. Why else did the founders confer upon us the power to regulate commerce among the several States? H. R. 3020 would permit an employer in one city to enter into a contract, but prohibit the same employer

from entering into a similar contract across the river in another State where it may be forbidden. Can the committee be jesting with us? I can think of no better way to drive employers and unions to distraction.

But even where State law permits union and maintenance of membership shop contracts they may be negotiated only where it appears, under oath, that the employer's agreement "was not obtained either directly or indirectly by means of a strike or other concerted interference with the employer's operations, or by means of any threat thereof." I cannot say what that really means, specifically. What is a threat between a union and an employer? It is not unusual in collective-bargaining meetings for each side to forecast the most horrible events for the other side—but that is part of the custom and folkways of collective bargaining. The consequences of the provision are certain. No such union-security provisions will be negotiated; they will come into effect only when the employer on his own initiation, and where he already believes that it will serve his interest, suggests a union-security clause. Thus, the quoted provision, in effect, will take union security out of the field of collective bargaining. If you have any doubt that my statement is correct, I suggest that you take a look at section 2 (11) on page 9 which describes the scope of "collective bargaining." The language starting on line 14 makes it clear that the closed shop, union shop, maintenance of membership and preferential shop are not one of the subjects which the parties are obliged to bargain collectively about, although the present Wagner Act requires it.

Another condition in section 8 (4) is that the procedure set out in section 9 (g) be complied with before a union-security clause becomes effective.

Section 9 (g) says that a union desiring a union shop or maintenance of membership shall state under oath to the Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act that the agreement for the union-security provision signed by the employer was not obtained by strike or threat. The Administrator then informs the employer of the union's application. If the employer does not object to the union-security provision—that is, if he stands by the bargain he has made—a secret ballot of the employees is held to determine whether they really and truly desire the provisions negotiated for them by their own representatives. If the employer does make objections—that is, if he turns on his bargain—a hearing is held before the Labor-Management Relations Board. If the Board finds that the matter affects commerce, it directs the Administrator to take a secret ballot of the employees in the bargaining unit as to whether they desire the agreement carried out.

We then come to one of the most preposterous provisions in the bill. In the ballot last mentioned, a majority of all of the employees in the bargaining unit must vote in favor of carrying out the provision, if it is to be regarded as outside the scope of the unfair-labor-practice section.

Members of the House, I direct your attention to that extraordinary provision on line 3 of page 35 in the bill before you. I do not know who drafted it, but whoever he is, he has no understanding or faith in one of the basic tenets of a democratic society. Such a society is built on majority rule. In our local, municipal, State, and Federal elections we accept the rule of the majority of qualified individuals who have cast their ballots. Those who stay at home are not counted on either side of an issue. In our fraternal and other private organizations, in our corporate directors' and stockholders' meetings, in our Supreme Court, in our congressional committees, and, indeed, in this very Chamber, and voting on this very bill, so long as a quorum is present, the rule of the majority of votes cast is the rule of the organization or institution. But section 9 (g) would require an affirmative majority of all of the employees in the unit to legitimatize a union-shop agreement. Those who stay at home are, therefore, to be counted as voting against the agreement. A premium is placed on employer intimidation. The employees will know that anyone who shows up to vote risks the displeasure of an employer who prefers an open shop, although he may have agreed, for strategic reasons, to union-security provisions.

Nor does the majority of the committee stop with these administratively unworkable and undemocratic provisions. It goes further and makes it an unfair labor practice for an employee or a representative of an employee to call, authorize, engage in, or assist in any strike or other concerted interference with an employer's operations, the object of which is to compel inclusion in a collective-bargaining agreement of provisions for any type union security whatsoever. This is done by section 8 (b) (3) of the proposed bill.

It is manifest that the end result of all of these provisions is to take from employees any reasonable means, by concerted action, to protect their union from antiunion employers and from the incursion of other competing unions. The bill drafters have done a job the objective of which cannot be mistaken by any Member of Congress. It is to give lip service to the proposition that good and strong unions of workers are necessary to our industrial democracy, but to legislate every possible obstruction and hindrance to their normal development and self-protection. In this respect the bill is hypocritical on its face.

This bill does not, as the Republican majority claims it has the voters' mandate to do, promote the usages of democracy in industrial relations; rather it undermines the institutons of democracy and makes a mockery of the legitimate aspirations of millions of American citizens as loyal and patriotic as any Member of Congress. It would deny to workers and their organizations those procedures and practices that are our democratic heritage and tradition. Unless H. R. 3020 is a grisly stupid joke—which I would prefer to consider it—or an irresponsible political trick, I regard it as one of the most impudent and reckless proposals ever put before Congress.

I say again, I shall not defend all of the abuses by unions of the various types of union-security arrangements. Unions, if they are to have power, must be responsible and democratic in their procedures and activities. We should legislate to promote democracy in unions. But we should not legislate, as is here proposed, to strike down the union-security provisions which contribute to industrial peace. Union-security provisions free unions from those two fears which more than anything else drive them to aggressive and sometimes antisocial conduct: One is fear of antiunion activity by the employer; the other is invasion and competition by another union. Union security enables unions to enforce that discipline among its members, the absence of which accounts for the unauthorized and quickie strikes which have plagued our industrial production in recent years. Union security enables a union to turn its attention from industrial warfare and to devote its attention to the constructive rather than the destructive aspects of labor relations.

The proponents of this bill seem to proceed on the theory that unions, as such, are evil and wicked things, and have no powers for good. The example of many good unions and the testimony of good employers and disinterested experts to the contrary, makes no impression upon them. Even then, however, they do not have the political courage and straightforwardness to legislate unions out of existence in a direct and manly fashion. They indulge in the shameful subterfuges and construct the elaborate booby traps that constitute the substance of this bill.

We are in a dramatic period of history. Part of the world is Communist. Great Britain is no longer a free-enterprise nation in our sense of the term. Our system is competing in the world market of ideas and things with the other great systems. We should be made sober by our historic responsibility—the responsibility of making strong and stable, for the future, all of our institutions, including our industrial relations. The one thing of which we may be absolutely certain in this world, is change. The world and its events are moving on and forward, for better or for ill. We must master the future by anticipating it and adapting ourselves to its requirements. The most generous thing I can say of H. R. 3020, is that it discloses that its framers do not look for their instruction at the condition of affairs in the world today and, apparently, are incapable of looking into the future. They have offered us a blueprint for a Neanderthal period in industrial relations. They think of the world as static, and would have the law of the jungle applied to labor relations with this qualification—all of the stones and clubs are to be put into the hands of those employers who remain unthinking enemies of unions. I should be false to my oath and my duty if I did not denounce this bill. I shall feel a deep sense of shame if this House approves it.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. Will not the gentleman in his remarks also call to the attention of the House the fact that there was at least one gentleman on the other side of the aisle who denied that we were entitled to all the credit for this bill and claimed some credit for himself?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize that. My remarks were very explicit. I said the majority of the Democratic members voted against the reporting of such a bill.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. I wonder if the gentleman prefers a condition to prevail that we saw right in that company within the last year, where the employees of General Electric and Westinghouse went out on strike for so long a period and for so little increase in their wages after all their striking, that it will take them a period of 9 years' steady employment to regain what they lost as a result of the strike. Does the gentleman wish that condition to prevail?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I do not wish that to continue. I say I would prefer the occasion of collective bargaining such as the one this week between General Motors and its workers. However, I am aware of the fact, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] is also aware of the fact that the General Motors profit figure for this last year, with their strike, due to the fact that they got a refund of some forty-odd million dollars in taxes, enabled them to take care of the strike which they had and still show a good profit on their ledgers.

So it has been all through the course of history, the workingman has always paid; he has paid for the privilege of getting a little high standard of living in society. It is not a profitable thing for a man to strike. No man likes to strike; these people do not like to strike, but they do not like to be held down either and denied the right to a decent standard of living while the profits of great corporations multiply as they have in the last year and while the prices of things the workers make go higher and higher and the purchasing power of the individual worker goes lower and lower. We cannot depend upon the benevolence of the great corporations. That has been shown time and time again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] may address the House for 45 minutes on Monday next after the regular business of the day and the previous orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI (at the request of Mr. HARTLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a chart.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. RAMEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter sent by Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watchworkers' Union.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boston Post of last Saturday.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the foreign labor supply bill (H. R. 2102) may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. POULSON, for 4 days, on account of the death of a close friend and associate, Lee Galloway, of Los Angeles.

To Mr. STANLEY (at the request of Mr. ALMOND), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. WORLEY (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 day, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LAWRENCE, MASS.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, they built a dam to back up the waters and then dug two canals to control the flow for the uses of industry, and in this manner a town was born and its name was Lawrence.

Looking backward, we realize how important was this river—called the Merrimack, after the Indian word meaning "swift waters"—in the birth and development of our city.

Most communities come into being by accident. A man finds a clearing in the wilderness and builds a cabin. He is joined by other families, and a settlement begins. Some enterprising person starts a store to service these people. Goods are brought in to stock the store. The products of the labor of the few families are exchanged for the goods. Each helps the other and so the community grows as its products and needs and services expand. That, in brief form, is the story of most places where people live together in sizable groups.

Lawrence, however, was an exception to this rule. It is the only "made-to-order" city in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In the early days, before the palefaces came, this general area was a sylvan paradise. Bodwell's Falls, now the Lawrence dam, and the shores of the Spicket were favorite resorts for the Indians, especially in the fishing season. Some old writers claim that this was the ancient seat of the Agawam Tribe and it was here that the Princess of the House of Pennacook came to reside.

But, as solitary and adventurous white men began to push the frontier up the Merrimack, the Indians withdrew to New Hampshire. A little more than a 100 years ago, if you stood on the top of Tower Hill, you would see rolling meadows and patches of forest in the valley of the river. And, if you strained your eyes, you might count the presence of 20 families by the plumes of smoke coming from the chimneys of the few scattered homesteads.

In 1793, there were settlements at Methuen and Andover, and there was a rough bridge across the river in this "in-between" country, to provide communications from one to the other. In 1801, a part of the bridge fell in ruins while a drove of cattle were passing over it, and 66 animals perished in the water below. It was repaired, in primitive fashion, and stood until 1807, when a great freshet and run of ice swept most of it away.

There was no Lawrence. There was merely the problem of a bridge, so that the few people in Andover and Methuen might reach one another.

But in 1825, a notable event took place. General Lafayette, of Revolutionary fame, was making a triumphal journey from Boston to Concord, N. H., and he had to cross the bridge. And the good farmers, from miles around, crossed the rolling hills and meadows and came down to the river. General Lafayette traveled in an open carriage and was escorted by several companies of infantry and cavalry and the people gave him a great cheer as he crossed the bridge. On that day scarcely a one gave much thought to the river.

The years passed, and the only sound one heard, apart from the ring of a woodsman's ax, or the lowing of the herd, was the music of the rapids at Bodwell's Falls.

Up to 1845 little change had taken place in more than a century. There was the solitary farmer, the river raftsman, and the fisherman who, with one drag of his net, pulled in a week's supply of food. That was all, except for the restless river flowing to the sea.

There was one man, however, blessed with the vision from which all great enterprise began. As he walked along the banks of the Merrimack he saw and was fascinated by, the unused power of the river. He was a man who never mislaid, or wasted, or destroyed anything that could become of any future use or value. Here, before his eyes, was the greatest physical power within the then-known reach of man, and its possibilities challenged his competitive spirit.

Somewhere, somehow, this potential power could be controlled to turn the wheels of industry in the service of man. And as he studied and thought over this problem, he came to the conclusion that there must be a more considerable fall between Lowell and tidewater in the Merrimack River, than was generally believed.

With a single assistant, and with no other instruments than a straightedge and a spirit level, he measured the fall of the various rapids and got a clearer picture of the mighty source of power and wealth, hidden within these few and unobtrusive rapids.

About 2 miles above the present location, at the head of Peters Falls, a dam could have been constructed at a smaller expenditure of money than where the present dam now stands. This would sacrifice a few feet of fall. So, at that time, a choice of location was by no means certain in this man's mind. On one thing, though, he was determined. He would find in one of the two localities, a great manufacturing center.

Without taking anyone into his confidence, he began to purchase, strip by strip, parcels of land on both sides of the river, until he held in his own right, the whole of Peters Falls.

Having gone as far as he could venture alone in so great an undertaking, he now opened up the whole matter to his nephew, J. G. Abbott, John Nesmith and Samuel Lawrence, all residents of Lowell, explaining what he had done and what he proposed to do.

Impressed by his sound business record and the glowing terms in which he described the possibilities of the project these men, together with Daniel Saunders, Jr., Thomas Hopkinson and Jonathan Tyler of Lowell, and Nathaniel Stevens of Andover, formed the Merrimack Water Power Association.

Some members of the Association, urged the purchase, as quietly as possible, of all lands in the immediate vicinity and as cheaply as possible.

The father of the enterprise opposed this procedure. He advised, instead, that the Association should announce its intentions of building, in one of the two locations to be decided upon, a new manufacturing city. Furthermore, he believed that the landowners should be offered a joint benefit, by taking bonds from the owners for the conveyance of their lands within a given time and at prices much higher than the value of these lands.

He was given authority to proceed along this line. Patiently he set about the task of contacting present and absent owners. The wise ones laughed and called the whole thing foolish, but who were they to refuse the fancy prices offered for mere farmland? In spite of those discouraging remarks, and the slow tedious job of convincing timid owners who had never made a conveyance of land in their lifetime that there was nothing to fear, this man stuck to his task.

The name of this man was Daniel Saunders, and he was a sturdy example of Yankee enterprise.

As the project developed, it was proposed to call the new town "Saunders" in tribute to the man whose vision and zeal brought it to life. To this, Mr. Saunders objected, stating that, as there was no town in Massachusetts called Merrimack, and as the new community was located on the river of that name, the settlement should be called "Merrimack" in honor of the river which inspired its development. And so it was, up to the time of its incorporation.

When the act of incorporation was asked of the General Court of Massachusetts, it was decided to call the town Lawrence after the Lawrence family, members of which were leaders among the up-and-coming textile manufacturers of that period.

Abbott Lawrence was principal stockholder of the group of capitalists who became interested in the building of the new textile center. At one time, he represented the United States as Minister to England.

Some will wonder why Mr. Saunders, who, more than any other one man, can take credit for this beginning, should have declined the honor of having his town named after him. His thoughts, however, were in another direction. Should the enterprise succeed, there would be satisfaction enough for him in seeing a thriving city rise from this countryside, giving employment to thousands; profits on capital invested, to others; and producing the clothing needed all over the earth.

On the 20th of March 1845 the Legislature of Massachusetts granted to the original association and their successors, the charter of the Essex Company, authorizing the construction of a dam across the Merrimack River. On the 16th of April, the stock of $1,000,000 having been taken up, the company was organized and the work began. An accurate survey was made, plans executed for a dam, canal, mill sites, streets, lots and public squares in the town, and on the 19th of September the first stone was laid in the company's dam. Within two years, the work was completed. At the time, it was one of the outstanding engineering accomplishments in the country. It is of granite, 1,629 feet in length, 35 feet thick at the base and twelve and a half at the top, backed by gravel to within a few feet of the surface. The granite blocks from which the dam is built, were hammered on the bed and laid in hydraulic cement. The overflow of water is 900 feet wide and the fall is 26 feet. In some places, the dam is as high as 40⅓ feet. The cost was only $250,000.

The north canal is somewhat over a mile long, 100 feet wide at the upper, and 60 feet wide at the lower end, and is 12 feet deep. It is 400 feet distant from the river and runs parallel with it. The river affords an average of 5,000 cubic feet of water per second, but sometimes it reaches 60,000. In the old days, a power thus obtained was estimated at 150 mill power. A mill power takes 30 cubic feet of water a second, with a head and fall of 25 feet. This produces a force calculated to give 60 to 70 horsepower. When the Atlantic Mills Corp. purchased the site for their factory, the price agreed upon for a mill power was $14,000, of which $9,000 was paid in cash, the balance of $5,000 remaining perpetually at 4 percent interest, payable annually in silver or its equivalent. The Atlantic Co. bought 20 mill powers, and the other corporations in proportion to their needs.

A second canal, on the south side of the river, was built in 1870. This detour of the river water to furnish power, is nearly a mile in length.

On the many occasions when the Lawrence pioneer, Daniel Saunders, reined up old Snow Ball, the white horse he rode, to the tumbling rapids, he dreamed of the possibility of harnessing that wasting power to the machinery of workshops and mills. His dreams came true in a manner exceeding his expectations. The town developed almost overnight. Acres of red-brick factory buildings crowded the banks of the river, gathering raw material from the wide world and scattering finished products far and near. Immigrants came from all parts of the earth to man the looms and the spinning machines.

How much the mills depended upon the water power furnished by the Merrimack may be gleaned from statistics published in 1880.

The motive power of the Washington Mills, producing 280,000 yards of goods a week, consists of 7 water wheels of 1,025 horsepower and two engines of 1,000 horsepower.

The Atlantic Mills, producing 23,000,000 yards of cloth annually, are powered by one steam engine of 500 horsepower, and four turbine water wheels.

The Pacific Mills, being the most extensive works of its kind in the world at that period, produced and printed a total of 65,000,000 yards of dress goods annually. This was sufficient to put a bandage three-quarters of a yard wide, once and a half around the world. This plant used 50 steam boilers of 3,000 horsepower, 37 steam engines of 1,200 horsepower, and 11 turbine water wheels of 2,000 horsepower.

The Pemberton Mills, producing over 6,000,000 yards a year, used steam double engines of 300 horsepower and 3 water wheels, each of 200 horsepower.

The Everett Mills, with an annual production of 8,000,000 yards of goods, de-

pended for its power on three turbine water wheels.

The Arlington Mills, turning out over 5,000,000 yards of goods a year, was supplied by one Corliss engine of 300 horsepower and three Swaine water wheels of 200 horsepower.

Lawrence was indeed a "corporate town," built by waterpower. The operatives in the mills lived in corporation boarding houses run by the mills. Indeed, the whole material welfare of the mills and the workers depended upon the Essex Co. The land and the power were all vested in this corporation. H. A. Wadsworth, in his History of Lawrence, Mass., states:

With the acceptance of the city charter (1853) came new duties, new responsibilities, and the clear-cut outlines of individualism faded away, with here and there an exception, and men became merely the mass.

The city was to grow until, during World War I, close to 100,000 people worked and lived within its small area of 6.75 miles. New and larger mills were built, including that of the American Woolen Co., a quarter of a mile long, the largest of its type in the world. In time, the mills began to rely more and more upon coal and steam to develop electricity which was used to power the machines, and the water-power of the river, never fully utilized, was now neglected. After the turn of the century, there was a concerted movement, carried as far as committee hearings before Congress, to have the mouth of the Merrimack dredged, so that barges might bring seaborne coal up the river to the mills. In view of the opposition presented by competing interests and the unfavorable report handed in by the Army engineers, this proposal was defeated. But the mills continued to use coal and oil brought in by rail.

If Daniel Saunders could return to life and stand again on the bank of the river which he loved, he would be dismayed by the changes which have come. True the city of Lawrence filters the water to make it fit for drinking as it comes through faucets into thousands of homes. The Merrimack serves the needs of the fire department, and its water is used for incidental functions in many offices and in every store and factory. But, by and large, to all the communities along its course, this river which gave birth to a great industry, has become just a sewer.

Daniel Saunders would miss the miracle of its power, once used and then largely forgotten before its full potentialities were realized.

This year Lawrence is celebrating the fact that 100 years ago it was incorporated as a town. It is a time, not only to review and rejoice over the things of the past, but to make progressive plans for the future. At the very moment when other regions are reaping the benefits flowing from the public development of cheap and abundant hydroelectric power, we look at our Merrimack and wonder why it is being neglected. For this river is not only the second largest in the six States, it is the source which originally powered New England to industrial greatness. But now it hurries wastefully to the sea.

In this centennial year the people of Lawrence recall the stories of our city's birth and growth.

They are reminded of the river which gave it being.

We do not intend to dwell on the industrial accomplishments of the past. Daniel Saunders was not a man to do so, and neither are we who live in 1947.

At this moment we are closer than ever before to the vision and will of the pioneers who founded Lawrence. Like the prodigal son, our generation has come back home. With a clearer understanding of first causes and fundamentals, we know that our one sure, unfailing resource is the dormant power of the Merrimack River. Inspired by recollections of the original enterprise and challenged by the present opportunity, we are determined to follow through on our predestined courses.

Only through greater use of the river's power potential, can the people of the Merrimack Valley realize their objectives of better production, better wages, and better living conditions. On this one hundredth anniversary, we in Lawrence are pointedly reminded that our future depends upon the unlimited development of the Merrimack River.

And so we are setting our sights on the establishment of a Merrimack Valley Authority to fully utilize this power for the common welfare.

That is Lawrence's goal as it goes forward into the second century of its life.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 350. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 731. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 16, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

545. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Taunton River, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 15, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 196); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

546. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 9, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of and a review of reports on the Wabash River and tributaries, Indiana and Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on June 28, 1938, and August 11, 1939, and requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on June 6, 1939, and August 2, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 197); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

547. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 8, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers, with a view to modifying the plans for flood walls and works for the protection of the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, and a preliminary examination and survey of Mill Creek Valley, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 28, 1937, and authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 198); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

548. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and the annual report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period; to the Committee on House Administration.

549. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of a landing craft for use by the Girl Scout mariner troop at Pacific Grove, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

550. A letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1945; to the Committee on Public Lands.

551. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $30,000 for the legislative branch, United States Senate (H. Doc. No. 199); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 181. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 245, current session, submitted to accompany the bill H. R. 3020, relating to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 256). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 334. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 385. A bill for the relief of Reginald Mitchell; without amendment (Rept. No. 259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 407. A bill for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall; with amendments (Rept. No. 260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 765. A bill for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler; with amendment (Rept. No. 261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 821. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 889. A bill for the relief of Russell F. Taylor; with amendment (Rept. No. 263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1015. A bill for the relief of Fred Pittelli; with amendments (Rept. No. 264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R 1067. A bill for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris; without amendment (Rept. No. 265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Paul Goodman; with amendments (Rept. No. 267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Hugh C. Gilliam; with amendment (Rept. No. 268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2257. A bill for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 3041. A bill to incorporate the American War Dads; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 3042. A bill to license persons operating motor vehicles upon highways and to make uniform the law relating thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 3043. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 3044. A bill to establish the Territory of Guam, to provide for the civil government thereof, and to confer United States citizenship upon certain of the inhabitants thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3045. A bill to place the office of Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction, supervision, and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 3046. A bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS (by request):

H. R. 3047. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, paragraph (t) of section 602, to provide lump-sum payment of national service life insurance claims which matured prior to August 1, 1946, in any case where the beneficiary, now receiving monthly payments, so elects; and to afford to the beneficiary an election of the optional modes of settlement of claims maturing on or after August 1, 1946; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3048. A bill to amend Public Law 704 to extend terminal leave benefits to next of kin of those who died prior to separation from service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3049. A bill to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

H. R. 3050. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide a more equitable method of paying for the transportation of mail and for subsidizing essential aircraft operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3051. A bill to amend the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780; 34 U. S. C. 485a), and to amend section 2 and to repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503; 34 U. S. C. 495), as amended, relating to the construction of vessels and aircraft, known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3052. A bill to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3053. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii an easement for public highway and utility purposes in certain parcels of land in the district of Ewa, T. H.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3054. A bill to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3055. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3056. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., an easement for public road and utility purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 3057. A bill providing for the transfer of a part of Fort Douglas, Utah, to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and conveyance of part to the State of Utah and public agencies of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 3058. A bill to provide for the establishment of a reservoir on Bear River, Utah, for the maintenance of water levels in the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3059. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place or places in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover new means of treating, curing, and preventing diseases of the heart and arteries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 3060. A bill to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to withhold the awarding of star-route contracts for a period of 45 days; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution designating the period from Thanksgiving to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the recent speeches on foreign policy, delivered by Henry A. Wallace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York.

H. Res. 183. Resolution to provide for a Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to migratory wild fowl; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Concurrent resolution of the House of Assembly, State of New Jersey, calling upon New Jersey's representatives in the National Congress and the legislatures of the sister States and all good citizens to restore the American Republic and the 48 States to the foundations built by our fathers.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 3061. A bill for the relief of Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3062. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3063. A bill for the relief of Emma Dumas, Anna M. Daigle, Glen Lemaster, John Luke, Nettie Mallinger, C. A. Seavey, Sandra

Sinkola, and Charles Young, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 3064. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Thomas Lucas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3065. A bill for the relief of Miguel A. Viera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 3066. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 3067. A bill for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3068. A bill for the relief of Alfred Thomas Freitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3069. A bill for the relief of Cecil T. May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 3070. A bill for the relief of Simon Broder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Hong Fort Chew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

328. By Mr. BRAMBLETT: Petition of Eloise Stoltenberg and others, relative to proposed legislation prohibiting liquor advertising in interstate commerce and via radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

329. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of Miss Amy M. Henry and others, for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

330. By Mr. JONES of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. Ella K. Lowry and 90 other mothers, Christian citizens, and members of a Sunday-school class, of Troy, Ohio, urging the passage of S. 265, which bans liquor advertisements in newspapers, periodicals, news reels, by radio, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

331. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the citizens of Knox County, Ohio, urging passage of S. 265, the Capper bill, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and to prevent the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

332. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of the Lake County Townsend Club, Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. Res. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

333. Also, petition of members of Boynton Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, Florida, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. Res. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

334. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the One Hundred and Seventy-first Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress to adopt H. R. 724, providing for the conveyance of the Bureau of Animal Industry quarantine station at Clifton, N. J., to the city of Clifton, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, in the face of life's mysteries and its vast imponderables, give us faith to believe that Thou makest all things to work together for good to them that love Thee. Strengthen our conviction that Thy hand is upon us, to lead us and to use us in working out Thy purposes in the world. Even though we may not see the distant scene, let us be willing to take one step at a time and trust Thee for the rest. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 15, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BROOKS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorun..

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hoey	O'Daniel
Ball	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Langer	Saltonstall
Capper	Lodge	Smith
Connally	Lucas	Sparkman
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McGrath	Thye
Eastland	McKellar	Tobey
Ecton	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Malone	Umstead
Flanders	Martin	Vandenberg
Green	Millikin	Watkins
Gurney	Moore	Wherry
Hawkes	Morse	Williams
Hayden	Murray	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Myers	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MEETING OF APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security may hold a meeting this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent for that purpose is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that I may be absent for the rest of the week on important public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee may meet this afternoon to hear a number of witnesses on the antimonopoly bill; and in that connection, inasmuch as I am chairman of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate this afternoon for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL LANDING CRAFT TO GIRL SCOUT MARINER TROOP, PACIFIC GROVE, CALIF.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Girl Scout Mariner troop at Pacific Grove, Calif., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a personnel landing craft for the use of that organization; to the Committee on Armed Services.